The Works of Bishop Grafton

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/worksofrtrevcha07grafiala

The Cathedral Edition

THE WORKS OF THE RT. REV. CHARLES C. GRAFTON, S.T.D., LL.D.

SECOND BISHOP OF FOND DU LAC

EDITED BY

B. Talbot Rogers, M.A., D.D.

WARDEN OF GRAFTON HALL, CANON OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, FOND DU LAC

IN EIGHT VOLUMES

Volume VII

MCMXIV

TO OUR ADORABLE LORD
AND ONLY SAVIOUR

JESUS CHRIST

THIS RECORD OF THE LIFE, LOVE AND WORKS
OF HIS DEVOTED SAINT
IS REVERENTLY INSCRIBED

A.W. Elson & Co. Boston

Yours in Christ

Charles C. Grafton

LETTERS AND ADDRESSES

BY

THE RIGHT REVEREND
CHARLES C. GRAFTON, S.T.D., LL.D.
BISHOP OF FOND DU LAC

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
LONDON, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS
1914

COPYRIGHT, 1914
BY LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

THE·PLIMPTON·PRESS
NORWOOD·MASS·U·S·A

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE RELATION OF MASTER AND SLAVE 1

LETTERS:

TO THE REV. OLIVER PRESCOTT *et al.*

THE FOUNDING OF THE ORDER OF ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST 26

AN AMERICAN RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY 89

TO A YOUNG PRIEST 119

TO CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS 123

TO CANON —— 131

TO A LAYMAN 134

TO ONE IN GREAT SORROW 164

TO AN ASPIRANT 165

TO A GODDAUGHTER 176

TO A BISHOP 184

TO A CANADIAN LAYMAN 186

TO *The Living Church:*

FOND DU LAC 195

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF DEPUTIES . 197

THE HOLY EUCHARIST 201

REMINISCENCES 205

BISHOP KOZLOWSKI AND THE QUADRILATERAL . . 212

CHILDREN AT THE EUCHARIST 215

RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT 216

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION AND OURS 228

TO *The Southern Churchman* 234

ADDRESSES TO THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT 237

GRAFTON HALL ADDRESS 307

THE REASONABLENESS OF THE CHURCH'S FAITH 313

LETTER TO THE ONEIDAS (1908) 322

INDEX 347

LETTERS AND ADDRESSES

THE RELATION OF MASTER AND SLAVE, AS IT EXISTS IN THE SOUTH, INCONSISTENT WITH THE SLAVE'S DUTY TO HIS CREATOR

Written by C. C. Grafton when at Harvard Law School, 1853, and printed for circulation by Wendell Phillips.

IT is difficult to speak calmly of great vices, to place the deepest, most intense feelings of the heart in the cold formulæ of an algebraic equation, or to force its quick pulsations to beat in regulated measure. God and the Right on the one side, Slavery and the Wrong on the other, are fiercely contesting for the supremacy. It is impossible for the most careless and indifferent to watch the contest without a passing emotion. The longer one looks into it, the clearer will be his perception of the Right. The more he analyzes the mighty issues, the more gigantic they appear; the more profoundly he meditates upon his own position, the more imminent seems his peril. It is not only a question of Humanity — of the degradation and demoralization of a Race — of cruelties unspeakable, that have made the word Slave a "litany of woe." It is not only a question of Liberty — personal, state, and

national — of free speech and trial by jury — of state rights invaded and laws defied — of national government perverted — perverted from its high purpose of affording here a shelter and asylum for the oppressed ones of tyranny — perverted from its true end of establishing a freer and purer government — perverted from its organic character, a Republic, and transformed, in fact, into an Oligarchy — but above and beyond this it involves an issue vital to Christianity itself. No peace has yet been declared between Evil and Good. They cannot live in harmony together. The war between them can terminate only in the annihilation of one of the combatants. Either Christianity must vanquish Slavery, or Slavery will overcome Christianity. All willingly admit it is an evil. Let us not strive to elude the question, Is it a sin? Many regard it as some far-off wrong; how few hearts feel keenly the conviction that it is a great national sin?

In examining this question we shall appeal to no sectional feelings. We even invoke not your spirit of humanity. We ask you only to remember that there is a God.

Let us here in the beginning fully and carefully state the question to be considered, that we may all clearly see and constantly keep in view the headland to which we are steering.

Names do not change the nature of things. To call a thing Slavery does not make it so. What is known as Slavery in one country or time may be only villiany in another. From the word Slavery

we cannot infer that the thing spoken of is the same as the relation which exists at the South, and is there known by that name. Slavery being a relation established by the law of the land, may be consequently different in every country. We cannot, therefore, show the law of Southern Slavery wrong, by simply proving the relation known in any other country as Slavery, to be wrong, — Roman Slavery, for example. We cannot prove the law of Southern Slavery right, by showing that of another country — Jewish Slavery, for example — to be right.

Our inquiry deals not then with Slavery as it exists in other countries or times, or with any abstract notion of Slavery, but with Southern Slavery as it exists among us to-day.

The question, then, for our consideration is this: Whether the relation of Master and Slave, as it exists at the South, is opposed to the Right and Truth? Whether the Law of Southern Slavery is consonant with or in opposition to the Law of God?

The law of Southern Slavery clothes one man with certain powers over another. The dominant one is called Master, the servient one Slave. The relation of Master and Slave consists in the control and power given the one over the other. Let us look at the law and see with what power it clothes the Master, and how it regards the Slave.

"A slave is one," says the civil code of Louisiana, "who is in the power of the Master to whom he belongs. The Master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor. He can do nothing,

possess nothing, nor acquire anything but what must belong to his master." Again, "Slaves shall be taken, reputed, and adjudged to be chattels personal, etc., for all intents and purposes whatsoever." In Jarman *vs.* Patterson, 7 Monroe, 644, the Court said, "Slaves, although they are human beings, are by our laws placed on the same footing with living property of the brute creation — a slave, by our code, is not treated as a person, but (negotium) a thing, as he stood in the civil code of the Roman Empire." "The condition of slaves (Ex. of Walker *vs.* Bostick, 4 Dess. 266) in this country is analogous to that of the ancients, the Greeks and Romans, and not that of the villains of feudal times. They can be sold as goods; they are held to be pro nullis, pro mortuis."

"It is plain," says Judge Stroud, in his sketch of Slavery, "that the dominion of the master is as unlimited as that which is tolerated by the laws of a civilized country in relation to brute animals." The Court of Appeals, in its decision (*Ex parte* Boylston, 2 Strobh, 43), said, "A slave can neither invoke Magna Charta nor common law, as is well said in Kenloch *vs.* Harvey, Harp. 514, 'Every attempt to extend a slave's positive rights is an attempt to reconcile inherent contradictions.' In the very nature of things he is subject to despotism. Law as to him is only a compact between his rulers, and the questions which concern him are matters agitated between them." In the State *vs.* Mann, 2 Dev. 263, Chief Justice Ruffin delivered the opinion of

the Court: "Such (the Slave's) services can only be expected from one who has no will of his own, who surrenders his will in implicit obedience to that of another. Such obedience is the consequence only of uncontrolled authority over the body. The power of the master must be absolute to render the submission of the slave perfect. As a principle of moral right, every person in his retirement must repudiate it. But it must be so. We cannot allow the right of the master to be brought into discussion in the courts of justice. The slave, to remain a slave, must be sensible there is no appeal from his master, and that this power is conferred by the laws of man, at least, if not by the laws of God." In Neal *vs.* Farmer, 9 Geor. 555, the Court held killing a slave no felony. They say: "The civil rights of the Master do not appertain to the slave — of these he can have none whatever. If the common law be applicable to a state of slavery, it would seem to be applicable as much in one as another particular. If he protects the life of a slave, why not his liberty? If he protects his liberty, then it breaks down at once the status of the slave. It is absurd to talk about the common law being applicable to an institution which it would destroy." Again: "The Georgia planter held the slave as a chattel. Whence does the planter derive his title? Either directly from the slave trader, or from those who held under him, and he from the slave-captor in Africa. The property in the slave in the planter became thus just the property of the original captor. There is no sen-

sible account to be given of property in slaves but this. What were then the rights of the African chief in the slave which he had captured by war? The slave was his to sell, or to give, or to kill." The same point was also decided in State *vs.* Fleming, 2 Strobh, 464 (1848). The Court held that an indictment does not lie at common law for the homicide of a slave, but that it was purely a statutory offense. Being a thing, property in a slave may be acquired by prescription (Little's Ad. *vs.* Chauvin, 1 Missouri, 626). Being a thing, he cannot acquire property (Ex. of Walker *vs.* Bostick, 4 Dess. 266). Being a thing, the peace, it has been held in some states, is not broken by the beating of it by a stranger. (Wheeler's Law of Slavery, 243.)

It is obvious, however, as a thing cannot be held accountable, that this doctrine would, applied as a defense for the slave, imperil the master's possession and his life. Hence in criminal law slaves are regarded as persons. The masters cannot wantonly take away the slave's life, or maim him (if it can be proved by white testimony). His power, in this respect, has been by statute abridged. For the one thing called slave is put on the same level, in some respects, with things of its kind — brute animals. A master, for instance, cannot torture the slave, or cruelly beat him in the open street. The reason is thus given by the Court (5 Rand. 678, Commonwealth *vs.* Turner): "Where one should take his slave into a market-place, and there violently beat him, it is not because it was a slave who

was beaten, nor because the act was cruel and unprovoked, but because it was offensive to public decency. The same would be the law if a horse had been so beaten, and yet it would not be pretended that it was in respect to the rights of the horse that this interposition would take place." For the same reason, by statute it has been rendered obligatory upon the master to supply the slave with a certain amount of food and clothing.

We find, then, that by this law the party called slave in this relation, is reduced from his place in the human family as person or man, and made a chattel or thing. That consequently he who occupies the position of master has power and control over the slave as over a thing. Now things cannot have rights — only Persons have rights. As a machine works for its owner and cannot, being a thing, derive any benefit to itself, so the thing called Slave cannot participate in the profits of his labor, which accrue solely to its owner. The machine must be protected from the atmosphere, fed with its daily allowance of wood and water, repaired when broken or deranged; so the slave machine must be housed at night, and daily stocked with water and bread. When broken or deranged, the peculiarity of its construction prohibits repair.

From the relation of master and slave thus established by the Law of Slavery, as it exists in Southern States, let us turn and briefly consider some of the rights conferred, and duties imposed, by the Law of God on the slave. Here, fortunately, the strife

of sect enters not. However else Geneva, and Oxford, and Rome may differ, here they are at peace. Let us begin at the beginning, with the statement of clear, simple, elementary truths.

The creature is the subject of the Creator. The will of the creator is the creature's law. God's will, then, is the law of man. The creature, man, owes the duty of obedience to his Creator, God. No lesser power than that which established the relation and imposed the duty, can remit or absolve man from its performance. Now man is a conscious and intelligent creature; is capable of apprehending his Creator's declared will with respect to his duty. He has, unlike other creatures, the power of choice between obeying and disobeying the will of his Creator. The tree must be obedient to its maker's law. Man has the power of election. Having then the power of obeying or disobeying his Creator's law, from which no earthly authority can absolve him, man is responsible to his Maker. This responsibility gives him corresponding rights, the imposition of a duty and responsibility necessarily conferring a right.

Now the creature, tree, is created a tree. It is subject as creature to its Creator. The will of its Creator is law. Not having the capacity like the creature, man, of obeying or disobeying its Creator, it necessarily obeys the law of its being. It is not then a responsible creature, for it is a thing. Not being responsible, it has no rights. Now the creature, man, is created a man. He owes to his

Creator a duty as man. He is also responsible to his Creator for the performance of that duty. The imposition of this responsibility gives him corresponding right — the right to be a man. A right, inherent, inseparable, inalienable — inherent in his nature, universal against the world.

It is unnecessary to give a perfect and absolute definition of this word man or to state all that under it may be implied or comprehended. The demonstration of the problem is not obscured or its conclusiveness impaired if we substitute other, or even regard it simply as an algebraic term. For example, this creature, man, owes a duty to his Creator for which he is responsible. No authority less than the Creator which imposed it can absolve from its performance. Created a responsible being (man), he has necessarily the corresponding right, to be a responsible being. Whatever "responsible being" may signify, it is clear it cannot be thing, for things are not responsible creatures. Now the question is, whether the Law of Slavery is the same, being in harmony with, or other and contradictory to, the Law of God. The Law of God has given and clothed the creature, man, with this right. The Law of Southern Slavery, in the relation of master and slave, takes this right away, and makes him a thing in direct opposition to the Law of God.

Note well the distinction between this opposition of the Law of Slavery to the Law of God, and solitary infractions of single ordinances and commands of the Almighty. Theft or Murder, for example;

they are infractions by individuals of single commands. But slavery establishes a Law with respect to the slave's being, in direct contradiction to that established by God. Slave law abrogates the rights of the slave, founded on his duty and responsibility as man.

Let us take a few examples of the most ordinary and simple duties imposed on the conscious and intelligent creature, and see how their performance by the slave is opposed and prevented.

Every person has some particular purpose or destiny to fulfil. However humble, he has a calling or vocation in life. Although much neglected, it is his duty to seek for and earnestly pursue it when found. This duty the party reduced to the status of slave cannot perform. The right conferred is by Slave law taken away.

The spirit and soul of man is destined for high and noble attainments; it is the duty of all to improve, and to bury their talents. All have a right, with respect to their fellow men, that no law shall prohibit and prevent their improvement. The Slave law crushes him down to the brute, and shuts from him the means of enlightenment.

To all mankind a Revelation has been made. It is the duty of all to search it, and learn thence their obligations. This duty gives to each an absolute right. This right and duty Slave law takes away. Against the will of the owner, the thing slave can claim no right to the consolations of Religion.

The will of the Creator is the law for the creature.

God's will is the law for man. There cannot be two laws for a man to obey with respect to the same duty. Man cannot serve two masters. He is then independent of his fellow creatures in everything respecting his duty to God. The relation of Master and Slave by giving unlimited power to the master, interferes with the relation of Maker and man. It substitutes the will of the Master for the Law of God.

It is the duty of each one to be guided in his actions by his own conscience. At least he may claim that to no one shall power be given, to compel him to be accessory to what he believes a sin. This duty Slave law interferes with — this right it takes away.

Upon every parent is imposed the weighty responsibility and duty of training up their children. Has he not, at least, the right that no fellow-man shall have the power of severing that connection and control, or of substituting his will for the lawful authority of the parent. This duty it subverts — this right it takes away.

No law of Christianity has been more clearly enunciated, its rights and duties more accurately defined, its holiness and sanctity more deeply inculcated than that of marriage. It forms a distinguishing and marked characteristic of Christianity itself. It distinguishes it from Idolatry and Heathenism. It ennobles man's nature. It has been elevated into a sacrament. It is taken as symbolical, even by our blessed Lord, of the con-

junction of Himself and His Church. "Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning, made them male and female? And said, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh — what therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." This relation of husband and wife, the relation of master and slave does not recognize. The assent of the parties' minds is the essence of a contract. The slave is made by the law a thing. Things cannot contract. Hence the slave, by the fundamental principle of Slave law, cannot marry.

"The marriage of Slaves," says the Court, "consists of cohabitation merely by permission of their owners. It does not constitute the relation of husband and wife." (The State *vs.* Samuel, 2 Dev. & Batt. 177, 181.) "Slaves cannot contract marriage," says Stroud. "The association which takes place and is called marriage, is one which has no sanctity, and to which no civil rights are attached."

"We do not see (Parsons on Contracts, 341) how any ceremonies, civil or religious, could make such marriage legal. We think that a slave cannot be guilty of adultery, when this crime can only be committed by a married person; nor of polygamy; nor made incompetent as a witness, on the ground of the relation of marriage."

And now for a moment consider again the tremendous power the master has of enforcing his

commands. The power given him by Slave law extends to the life of the slave only as prevented by statute. "He cannot be indicted for the cruel, excessive beating of his slave." (5 Rand. 678.) He is, however, prohibited from wantonly taking the slave's life or limb (if it can be proved by white testimony), provided the slave be not outlawed, or in an act of resistance. In State *vs.* Weaver, 2 Hay. 54, the law was thus given to the jury, "If the slave used force, and was resisting by force when he was killed, or if he offered to resist by force, the prisoner is justifiable." The statutes of all the states are not exactly alike, and the power in some is not so much abridged. For instance, the Court (3 McCord, 533, The State *vs.* Guy Raines) decided that "the act of 1821, rendering it murder to kill a slave, does not take away from the prisoner, if he be master or overseer, in whose possession the slave was killed, the right of exculpating himself by his own oath. And the fact of a third person (white) coming up at the moment of the death, after the wounds were given, will not alter the case."

It is needless to ask whether such a power of man over man is compatible with the Law of God. By that Law every man is independent of the law of his fellow men in everything, in respect to the duty of obeying God's clear and positive commands. Slavery makes no exception in the power it gives the master in favor of this right, which every man has on account of his duty to his Creator. "Every

attempt to extend to a Slave positive rights, is an attempt to reconcile inherent contradictions; for in the very nature of things, he is subject to despotism." No matter to what the slave reposes obedience, the master is clothed by law with a most fearful and tremendous power for the enforcement of his commands. The slave's duty to his Creator is to disobey what the relation of Master and Slave may legally compel him to perform. Every hour of each day, each minute of every hour, is weighty with the responsibility which the relation of Maker and Man imposes. Can this artificial relation established by Slave law be in accordance with that higher one established by God's law, when it cannot, without imperiling its existence, even recognize the relation of Maker and Man? There is hardly a command in the decalogue, not an injunction of Christianity, which slavery does not violate. It transforms the person of Man into a chattel or thing. It substitutes the will of the Master for the Law of God. It prevents the performance of the duties the Slave owes to his Creator,— it abrogates the rights which follow them. Would it be atrocious to deprive the body of sight; is it not infinitely more so to destroy that of the mind? Is it sinful to inculcate disrespect to parents; is it not a more fearful violation of God's commands to destroy the relations of parent and child, and husband and wife? Is it criminal to steal from another the labor of his hands? Slavery intensifies this crime also, and seizes from a man his very self. Is it infamous to commit adultery?

Slave law reverses that decree, and even weakens the command, "Thou shalt do no murder."

Let us now examine briefly some of the popular fallacies and objections. We have not assumed, it will be observed, the equality of the black and white race, nor even that they descended from one common progenitor. The self-evident, undisputed fact was alone taken, that the black was possessed of those faculties which made him a responsible being.

Perhaps the most popular and the most fallacious of objections is the assertion that the Bible supports slavery. There are some things which the common sense of mankind has regarded as acknowledged truths. What it has once tested in its crucible and found to be gold, it does not again analyze. It has not had time to listen to those who deny the existence of an outward world. Some subtle fallacy, it knows, lurks in the meshes of the metaphysician. Practical wisdom feels there is a fallacy somewhere without unraveling the snarl. It tests the soundness of reasoning by its results. It builds railroads and subscribes to stock, though it cannot answer the ingenious argument of the sophist, that proves it an illusion. Having demonstrated that relation of master and slave is inconsistent with the duty the slave owes his Creator, it logically follows that the revelation of that law and duty cannot support a relation inconsistent with it.

That arguments can be manufactured from the Bible in its favor, is not a matter of surprise. Arguments can be made on both sides of every question.

"There are objections," said Dr. Johnson, "against a plenum and objections against vacuum, and yet one must be true." God's revelation of man's duty must be consistent with the known relation of Maker and Man. "Your argument," says Practical Wisdom, "must be somewhere fallacious if it seeks to put any other construction upon it. Much labor will not enable me to sweep away your fog, but ascend a little the mountain and you can overlook it." It is a sufficient demonstration of the traveler's mistake, that his road has brought him to a wrong destination. It is unnecessary to point out the various fallacies of that construction of the Bible which makes it sanction Southern Slavery. It is sufficient to demonstrate that such argument leads to an impossibility. Nevertheless, when it is argued, because Jewish Slavery was tolerated, therefore Southern Slavery is right, it may be suggested, that to lay the foundation for the argument, the analogy must first be perfectly demonstrated. It must be proved that the Southern States are under the same instant and immediate direction of the great God as the Jewish nation; text and passages cited, reducing the slave from his position in the human family as person, and transforming him into a thing; clear and positive injunctions shown that he shall be considered as "chattel personal for all intents and purposes whatsoever," and shall be deprived of all rights, and made subject to despotism.

Explicit commands are adduced depriving the slave against the will of his master to all right, even to

life, except as the master may see fit partially to grant protection by statute. Cogent and plenary testimony is produced that the slave was regarded by Jewish law as a brute animal. The last exception to the seventh commandment discovered, "that a slave cannot commit adultery." The decree produced prohibited marriage, and forced the slave to live in a state of concubinage. The voice of God is heard giving power and dominion to man over man, as clearly as in Eden He gave it to man over brute.

Not until then Jewish Slavery is proved in all these respects the same as Southern Slavery; and further, not until the slave is demonstrated to have been deprived of all rights;[1] not until the Jewish master's power and authority is shown to have been unlimited by even constant priestly oversight and control, or otherwise; not until the theory of an unlimited power is reconciled with the command, "Thou shalt not deliver unto the Master the servant which has escaped unto thee;"[2] not until the fair construction that the slaves sold themselves to their masters, and so voluntarily entered into a Relation for a term of years, little differing from master and servant, is excluded, will the argument that the Old Testament sanctions Southern (American) Slavery take a logical form.

But it is sometimes said, the New Testament sanctions slavery. Did not St. Paul send back a slave, who had escaped from his master? What are the facts? Onesimus, a slave of Philemon,

[1] See Exodus xxi: 26 and 27. [2] Deut. xxiii: 15.

having robbed his master, fled to Rome. He was there converted to Christianity by St. Paul. Such were his talents and piety that the Apostle desired his labors in the ministrations of the Gospel.[1] If Paul sent Onesimus at once upon his work, should Philemon hear that his dishonest slave was preaching the Gospel, and pretending to have authority from Paul, he would at once, being himself intimate with the Apostle, denounce Onesimus as a hypocrite and impostor, seize his slave, and perhaps put him to death. A communication to Philemon was therefore necessary. It was also the duty and wish of Onesimus, now a Christian, to make restitution and ask his master's forgiveness. Paul will make restitution for him.[2] And to teach each their duty, the Apostle sends Onesimus as bearer of his epistle, back to Philemon. It is the only instance of the return of a fugitive slave to his master in the inspired word. For some wise and significant purpose, doubtless, it is there recorded. Did St. Paul send Onesimus back into slavery? In a humble and foreright spirit let us examine the Epistle, and learn our duty.

It commences with the Apostolic greeting. In it St. Paul salutes Philemon with such endearing, loving terms, as only he had used to Timothy, his son. The better to excite Philemon's compassion towards Onesimus, he first excites it towards himself. "Paul, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, unto our

[1] Epis. Phi. 13: and see Col. iv: 7 and 10.
[2] Epis. Phi. 18, 19.

dearly beloved and fellow laborer. Grace to you, and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." With great address and skill he first warmly commends Philemon for his love and faith, which has come to his hearing. And "I thank my God," says the Apostle, "making mention of thee always in my prayers, that thy faith may become effectual by the acknowledging (or doing) of every good thing which is in you in Christ Jesus." And then after this beautiful, winning, ingenious exordium, he again praises him, having "great joy and consolation in thy love." Then he proceeds: "Wherefore, though I might be much bold in Christ to enjoin thee that which is convenient (proper), yet for love's sake I rather beseech thee. I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds (whom I have, while in prison, converted to Christianity), whom I have sent again; thou therefore receive him that is my own bowels (my very soul — my own dear son). For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him forever; not now as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord. If thou count me, therefore, a partner, receive him as myself. If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee aught, put that on my account. I, Paul, have written it with my own hand. Having confidence in thy obedience, I wrote unto thee, knowing thou wilt also do more than I say."

Solemnly in Christ's name speaking with the voice

of inspiration, the great Apostle enjoins and beseeches Philemon, "having confidence in his obedience," to receive his dear son, Onesimus, "not now as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved." Although he might in virtue of his high office enjoin upon Philemon his duty, yet with great tenderness and delicacy he would rather fashion it as a loving entreaty. But the Apostle, first having won him, in concluding, puts him upon his obedience. He is to receive Onesimus, "not now as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved."

It may, perhaps, here be objected, that all here meant, was, that the master should receive him again without punishment; that Philemon was simply to receive him as a Christian brother — not that it was his duty to manumit him.

This was not much of a favor or "benefit" (verse 14) for St. Paul to ask or for Philemon to grant.

Philemon was a Christian. As he forgave others their trespasses, so he prayed his might be forgiven. Had the penitent Onesimus sought his master, bringing not an epistle from the great Apostle, but only his own bitter tears of repentance, and, for their dear Lord's sake, besought his master's forgiveness, think you it would not have been obtained? Those were days of practical Christianity. Would not Philemon, the dearly beloved fellow laborer of Paul, have forgiven his brother once? Think you he would have raised his hand to punish while the echoes of that divine choral over the repenting sinner were yet lingering in the courts of heaven?

Would it not have been tidings of great joy to Philemon, that in the humble manger of his poor slave's heart a Saviour had been born? Think you his looks of love and forgiveness would not have far outrun his speech?

If this was all the import of the epistle, why should St. Paul so entreat and beseech Philemon? Why does he put him upon his "obedience"? Why does he speak of it as a "benefit" to be conferred? Why such consummate art and skill displayed in every phrase? Why does he deviate from his customary mode of address? Why such care and discreetness in the opening and management of his subject? Why, with an intensity of feeling that trembles in every line — in Christ's dear name — for love's sake — does Paul, "the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ," with many an endearing word of affection, besiege Philemon's heart? Not till he has thus laboriously prepared the way, does he enter upon his theme. He is telling Philemon something more than merely to receive Onesimus as a Christian Brother. Philemon needed not an Apostle to write an inspired epistle, to tell him that. He is telling him to receive Onesimus as a brother in both senses of the word. But we do the Apostle and the inspired Word great wrong thus to linger with inferences. Clear and emphatic are the words of inspiration; they meet the very point, and prevent all possible misunderstanding. Onesimus was to be received "not now as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved, both in the Flesh and in the Lord.

If thou count me," says St. Paul, "as a Partner, receive him as Myself."

And it may be noticed that Onesimus, after a little time, according to Calmet, returned to Rome. From this time his employment was in the ministry of the Gospel. We find him with Tychicus, bearing St. Paul's epistle to the Colossians, to "know their estate and comfort their hearts." (Col. iv. 7 and 9.) He was afterwards raised and appointed to a bishopric by St. Paul. This is recorded both in the Apostolic constitutions, and in the Roman martyrology.

How often is the text, "Servants or slaves, be obedient to your masters," quoted as proving the law of Southern Slavery right? Is the word of God to man contained in any single phrase, or does the whole Bible taken and construed together, make up the One Word of God? Would it be right to make deductions of abstract principles from those instances in Holy Scriptures where the life of man has been justifiably taken, to mold them into the fundamental law of the land, and to leave out altogether the injunction "Thou shalt not kill"? How would the common sense of mankind answer the sophist who would cite the Bible as authority for such a code as would be thus established. Because a precept is found with respect to servants, is the law which has engrafted it upon the statute book, in accordance with or sanctioned by the word of God, when it has omitted to equally place the commands and injunctions to the masters there also? The ques-

tion is, whether the Slave law is in accordance with God's revelation? It takes one single command to a particular class, and works it to death. To the last possible or conceivable deduction that can be hazarded from it, Slave law expands and develops it, and makes it the fundamental law of the slave's being. When not only, "Slaves, be obedient to your masters," is found developed on the Southern statute book, but also, "And ye masters do the same things unto them, forbearing Threatening" (Eph. vi. 9); when the divine command, "Masters give unto your slaves that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a master in Heaven" (Col. iv. 1), is also to the same extent, and in equal degree and force, put on the statute book, can Divine authority be cited in its support. Commands are given to the slave — commands are laid upon the master. Southern Slave law adopts the precepts given to the one, and entirely omits the other. Is it, then, in accordance with Divine revelation, when it suppresses half of it? It is unnecessary, we repeat, to point out the fallacy of this argument, that the Bible supports slavery. But does the intelligent and candid mind experience here any great difficulty in discovering the error?

Briefly has this question been treated, and much have we left unsaid. But so far from supporting the Law of Southern Slavery, as it exists to-day, the doctrine of the New Testament annuls it. The Apostles did not omit to speak of so great a wrong. They found a Relation of Master and Slave exist-

ing, and they laid upon it stringent laws and regulations. Place upon the Southern statute book the divine command to the master "to forbear threatening," and what becomes of the Relation of Master and Slave? Carry fully out on its pages the dogma that the slave owes a duty to his God, and what becomes of the "uncontrollable authority of the master"? Lay the master under as severe penalties to give unto the slave that which is just and equal before God, as the slave is laid under to be obedient unto his master, and what becomes of the Southern Relation of Master and Slave? Would you, in such a case, clothe the Slave with Rights? If so, he is no longer a slave. "To clothe the slave with positive rights, is to reconcile inherent contradictions." Would you, in such a case, protect, in a measure, the slave's liberty? "If you protect his liberty, you break down the status of slave." If the law compels the master to recognize the slave as a brother beloved, and give unto him that which is "just and equal," he must recognize the slave as a man, and give unto him the rights of a man. The moment Slave law declares the slave a man, it pronounces its own destruction. If the slave is by law declared a person, he is not a thing; if not a thing, he is not a Southern Slave. If Slave law is in harmony with God's law, how is it that incorporating the latter with the former destroys the Relation of Master and Slave? Does then the Bible support Southern Slavery?

It has been shown that Slavery is sinful, because

it deprives the slave of the rights which his Maker has conferred, and prevents the performance of those duties which the law of his being imposes.

Briefly the nature of that sin has been shown. Unlike the infractions, by individuals, of single commandments, it is the establishment of an organic law in direct antagonism to that of God. Either, then, Christianity must vanquish Slavery, or Slavery will overcome it. In presenting the question, we have carefully avoided any appeal to the feelings. Simply as one interesting to the candid and philosophic mind has it been discussed. To the incidental evils Slavery breeds; of the wrongs it inflicts to man, woman, and child, in every department of life, bond or free, we have not alluded. It was to no story of the slave's sufferings your indulgence was asked. That can be found elsewhere. Over this Christian land many a stained footprint is seen, pointing northward. The waters of many a Southern river go troubled on their way for the broken hearts that lie beneath. Our inquiry was: Is the Law of Slavery in accordance with the Law of God? Our answer: The Relation of Master and Slave interferes with the Relation of Maker and Man.

LETTERS

The Founding of the Order of St. John the Evangelist

To the Rev. Oliver Prescott *et al.*

Boston, Tuesday, May, 1865

Dear Oliver:

I HAVE been expecting your letters, but have not received any as yet. I hope they may come in this afternoon, but I do not know whether there is more than one carrier's delivery daily. If any letters arrive here, I shall leave word to have them forwarded to London. My address will be Care Messrs. Baring Bros. & Co., London. Drs. Bolles and Oliver gave the certificates of a few persons. I don't know why it is necessary to send more than the names to G. F. Lee, of the members in this country. But I will take these, however, and hope to receive those you are to send on my arrival in London.

The difficulties at the Advent are at present in no form of solution. I don't think Dr. Bolles will go away. He don't mean to; should he receive a call to a parish of like position and influence, he would consider it, and the state of affairs at the Advent would lead him to do so, but just now he intends to remain. The corporation have not put back his salary to the rate on which he was called, although

the general offertory has increased. It seems to me that if the Advent chose to entrust the selection of a clergyman to Dr. Shattuck, it ought not to visit upon unoffending Dr. Bolles the consequence of their own act. If they have not got a man who suits them, whose fault is it? He does his best. He gave up a first-rate parish where he was beloved to come to the Advent, and did so on principle to aid the free-church movement. He is not a great preacher. Is not a ritualist, etc., and has a corporation, and Trustees, and a vestry to work with. It is enough to swamp any one but a saint.

Bishop W. wrote me and offered me the little chapel of St. Matthew, in Baltimore, to begin our fraternity work in. All which of course we can consider, when we return. I think both sides of my family are inclined to do something toward a church. My brother's death has touched them all, and I think they would like to put up a Chancel as a memorial. I see they are all drawing more to it.

Don't pledge yourself to any. We must be very careful of ourselves, and so of any we would associate with us. I am glad you are going to Oxford, I am, and hope it is so determined. We had better, I think, keep out of the way as much as possible and lie hid and wait God's leadings. The great work is with ourselves. The hard thing to do is to be daily faithful to all our duties.

It is for His Sake and in His Name I would write, dear Oliver, to you. You said you thought you saw a way was opening. I won't trouble you

again about this matter, but beseech you, command you to take this letter as you would a call to a parish. It is to you an intimation which you must consider, and I feel compelled to write this to you. Either you are called to a religious life or not. If you are, you must correspond to that call and you must decide that question and act upon it now. You ought not to let the matter hang on any longer. It has nothing to do with any openings for work offered you by any parties in the United States.

The question for your soul is whether God has called you to that life. Is it your vocation? That is the whole issue. Have you the desire for it? I do not write to one who is a novice, but your heart is all aglow for it, and you have desired it over and over again. Has God manifested that it was not His Will by putting insuperable hindrances in the way? The dealings of God are the calls to vocation. The trials He sends are the purification of the soul for the rectification of motive. He tests us by difficulties. We must leave our nets and fishes to follow Him.

The only things in your way are first the parish where you are. If God has called you to the religious life, etc., that settles itself. You ought to leave it at once, knowing He will provide for it, and it can support a clergyman, and there are at least several hundred who can do the work there as well as yourself, and some a good deal better.

Second. *Family duties.* You have settled that matter. It is clear if you give up to your sisters

your portion, they are not worse off for your going. What if you had gone some years ago, or had become a Roman Catholic priest? If they have now a part in the sacrifice, it is blessed for them. I have no doubt they will be able to get on without your help. They are excellent managers.

Third. *Money to come over and begin.* I will be responsible if you do not have it, and if you come out to join us, for your board here for three or four months. I cannot think you have any debts at the present time, and that under the circumstances you would not be justified in taking out of your portion some $400 or $500. You might make over to your sisters all your rights for that sum, and so obtain the present funds. Besides you have your furniture, pictures, etc., which you might give them or sell, with a good many needless books. Possibly your Congregation might make you a purse.

I made my general confession to E. B. P. after two days' preparation.

At present I am staying a few days at All Saints, London. My intention is to attend the retreat under Mr. Carter about the 6th of July. He is the most noted Director in England (with E. B. P. excepted), the best perhaps. He is at least one of the very best. I met him the other day.

Dear Oliver, I think God is raising up saints in England. There is a class of men, of good men, who are pressing matters of ritual, etc., and we hear perhaps more of them; but there are others, who (of course in ritual far ahead of the high and dry and

what we see in America and whose acts at the Altar, etc., are all we would ask) are certainly living holy lives.

I went into a little church near Oxford, or in Oxford, and I was more impressed with the sacrifice than ever in my life. It was a low celebration. It was rather slow, but oh, so very, very solemn. No show; no music; nothing could equal the effect. The priest had begun to look like a Saint, and I knew was indeed a very holy man, a man of great humility and sacrifice. The church was in a poor part of the place. A poor little iron-looking affair, without any pretence or show, and yet the service was the most solemn I ever attended in my life.

Send a list, please, as soon as you can, of Secretaries. My sermon is in print. I wrote it at the hotel, and it is a poor representation of America. To help in the Cause you must import a copy, Second Series. Dr. Littledale is the editor of the *Church Times;* Rev. G. F. Lee, of the *Union Review;* T. Chamberlain, of the *Ecclesiastic.*

Dr. E. B. P. is soon to be out with a new book, occasioned by Manning's letter; and also the Tract 90 is to be republished here, so Durand had better wait and get the preface which will be written on this side. The new book of E. B. P. will be stronger than Tract 90; yet will be strong in some points of the Latin Controversy.

There is a good deal of feeling here in respect to the revival of Religious Orders. A good many, I find, are thinking and working for it. Men are ready

to give themselves to it. Before long another movement will be started. I have attended some meetings of subcommittees on that subject.

I still question a good deal about Brother I., whom I have seen and whose sermon in St. Martins Hall I listened to. One thing I am pretty clear about; he is not the model for us to follow. We must not be monks, but a modern order. The ancient spiritual life embodied for work by the wisdom and experience of the church.

With much love to all,

Yours, etc.,

C. C. G.

LONDON, Monday, July 17, 1865.

MY DEAR OLIVER:

It may be a day or two before I finish this — as I am very much pressed indeed by many matters. I received on Saturday the 8th, as I passed through London, two letters from you. One dated the 16th, and the other the 22nd of June. My letters sometimes remain a long time at Barings because I am traveling about and cannot tell where I shall be. I was on my way to East Grinstead where I passed Sunday, and then went to Hurst to the Retreat, after which returned to London, and now have the first opportunity since receiving yours, which I read there in the cab, to answer them. I have read them over carefully now, and am glad to find you in good spirits and well. I will take things as you have mentioned them.

First. Brother Ignatius: Perhaps you have seen there has been a trouble at the monastery and the chaplain, the Rev. G., has left and some of the monks. My own feeling is, that God may be leading Brother Ignatius by these chastisements and trials into a better way. One likes his boldness, etc. But I simply say that the monastery does not present my calling. Nor is Brother Ignatius the one God has pointed out for me to follow in the way of a religious. I saw him in London and I heard him at St. Martin's Hall. To me he is not effective, but tiresome as a preacher, and I don't think likely to attract a multitude to continue to listen to him. The hall was about one half full; there were some four hundred, possibly five hundred, present. He has put down the price of admission, which was one shilling (two and six for reserved seats) — and there may be a greater number present now. How he will turn out I don't know, whether it is at all for the good of the Church of England that he should succeed, I cannot say. That he may damage the cause by his line is possible. But he seems to be acting in a spirit of disobedience to the lawful authorities. Either he is under his Bishop or some Anglican Bishop, or as a monk, he is under the Pope. There must be some one whom he should obey; and the point able and good and thoroughly catholic men make is, what right has he to have public celebrations of the Eucharist in his chapel? The thing is all in a muss. The monks with him are very common persons, and none stay long.

He is not acting under Dr. P's advice. The effect of his sermon at St. Martin's was much injured to me, by a handsome stole which he wore. It seemed incongruous to lecture the women on dress, when he is rather famous for taking that line himself.

I fear more and more all dressing up. Vestments are the last things we should do; what we seek to change, is souls.

My relations with Brother Ignatius are friendly, but I don't think I shall go there again. My experience is the same with that of some others.

Second. I am glad you are not driven into a discussion of the A.P.U C. Let the time of speaking tarry yet a good while. What we want is simply prayers and not discussing of any kind. It is a great deal better to leave the Christian series and all papers unanswered.

I thank you for the suggestion of the Cistercian Monastery, and may get there. Dr. Neale promised me a letter, etc.

About Brother Ignatius, etc., please take me on trust. I know your own opinion would be mine.

I would not make the A.P.U.C. a prominent part of our work. It will be enough for us to be religious, without giving any one a Cry against us. I think it well for such persons to take up one line; to push one thing. Not to mix up his positions, so that while defending one, he is open to a side attack. I mean, that a religious community formed with the chief object of winning the souls of the young men and especially making a holy life their mission,

should not be mixed up so prominently with anything else as to be open to the attack. Oh, yes, you may say you are for winning souls and all that, but the real thing you strive for is to bring back popery and put us all under the Pope. The prominent men of the A.P.A. must bear that and can defend that, but I don't want Brotherhoods to be damaged by that cry, or have anything to bear except straightforward attacks. All movements and cases and causes are attacked most effectively by a side thrust, by a cry, by some unfairness, by mixing up things, and though we have gone on in the A.P.U.C., yet I would let others speak and write for it, and just for a while stand a little towards the rear in that matter. At least I think if we are for a brotherhood, then we should make that the chief thing.

Third. I will go to John Phillips, but as you will see from this, the opening of Providence seems a little different than at my last. It is clearer and wider, and I may not be back quite as soon as I then thought and I don't want to buy anything now.

Fourth. I think a low mass set, that is for the celebrant alone, can be got for £5 (quite poor) to £10 a really good set. Will ask what a set for Celebrant deacon and sub-deacon will cost. Deitrich is one of the best makers. Some of the vestments used are imported from Belgium, others are made by the Sisters. If you want Altar Cloths, there is a society at Wantage that works very well indeed. Said to have some of the best and claimed

to have one, the best worker in England. The cost is not so much as in the stores, and the profit is given to the Sisters at Wantage. Dr. Neale's Sisters are making me a surplice; a short one for common use. Price fifteen shillings, also they make vestments. I shall be there this week (D.V.) and will ask their price for a set as you describe for Mr. Bishop. I like the idea of their making the vestments. The shops of Mrs. Beard and others do the work very well, but the cost is great and it is shop work and the money of course not given to charity. The English use just now is for the yoke-crossed chasuble. Those at St. Matthew's were made very full, but found inconvenient. Something between the Roman scantiness and the Medieval abundance is preferred. I suppose £20 will get a full set. Whether it is advisable to use them I don't say. It would be bad to commence and be obliged to give up. Is America ripe for them? If there were near a score of people waiting in Church after evensong, as I have seen waiting their turn to go to confession, it would be another matter; yet, even in that case the incumbent has only the Linen vestments as yet. It is a good way to begin, and then to add colored stoles; but there are many here who are anxious the vestment matter should not be pressed, or get into the papers. Let there be a gradual development. Let it creep on in many parishes. Don't make it so prominent. Don't herald it in newspapers. Don't report your services. Don't attract attention, which is unspirit-

ual and devoluting in itself, and may also arouse opposition which will crush the work. The seed that can easily be destroyed when first cast into the ground or when just springing up, is strengthened by the blast, when it has pushed its roots far and wide and got a good hold, and got its growth. The vestment question is booked to come off next spring and then there will be a contest, and my own opinion is, that America had better wait on the movement in England.

Fifth. I should like some of Dix's sermons very much and can distribute them with good effect. How many can you send conveniently? Let me have them if you can send them without much cost.

Sixth. I will send your letter to Editor of *Church Times* this week.

Seventh. I would let H—— alone, entirely alone, except to pray for him, if I were you. I fear you are only doing yourself great harm and him no good and laying up trouble in store for yourself and for the cause by talking with him. You can't convince him or alter him, and I don't think one should lay themselves out upon such men. All you say may come back some day upon you in a way you little expect. You are only supplying the enemy with the most fatal kind of ammunition, etc.

Eighth. I am not likely to see Brother Ignatius again, but if you desire a pattern will try to get one before I leave. But for what do you want it? I should think you could make one from the prints.

Ninth. I like Dr. N., but it would be only a mat-

ter of curiosity to see him. I am going to write a letter to F——, but as I don't know his address, I shall send it to you, which I must ask you to read and send a note to him as you think best, backing it up if you think it ought to be sent, and this leads me to my own goings about.

God is most marvellously working in this portion of His Church.

By a series of wonderful providences, men are being drawn to a religious life, and are being drawn together. It is the most aweful and solemn of anything I ever knew. One feels every moment should be occupied in prayer, lest one may go wrong or thwart His Leadings or mar His Blessed work. The mercy of God has allowed me to know of what has been done, and to see something of it, and, if I am not unworthy, of casting in my lot with it,

I send you a prayer which has been said by some in which you will be glad to join. If God will, very quietly indeed in the autumn, some persons will get together and the work be begun.

Some of England's saintliest men will direct by their counsel the work, and some of them will be in it. We did not know there were such men. It is a piety we have read of. Quiet, unobtrusive, everyday looking, unnoticed by the great mass, unknown, unboastful, without display, or controversy, or church party spirit, or the desire of personal success, hidden but deep and true and real and wise. You might think, Mr. Carter for instance, an ordinary Christian. He would hear ones chattering as if

there was something in it, but those who know him better, know him to be above what we ordinarily see. God is educating and raising up Saints here. It is very awful. It is with carefulness I use the word. There are men here who are very holy, saintly men. Under the direction and advice of such (and this, all this, is between ourselves, and ourselves only, under all and every consideration, neither to be spoken of in detail or hinted at in the gross) the movement is taking shape.

What you want to do is to keep the Bishops off from questions of doctrine until they have become more Catholic. It is always a blessing when a Convention goes by and they have done nothing. How you can be relieved now is the question. Possibly, before one's death or if occasion required, one might make the statement to the public. The Church public have forgotten the matter, and when the question comes up again, it will be considered de novo. It must grow by practice. Discussion does harm. Very, very little has been said comparatively about confession, but it would be impossible to check it in England, because it has silently become a great reality. If one should be charged with not having kept one's promise, one can say, I did wrong or made a mistake in making it, or did it being told by the Bishops that it has no force elsewhere, or have been dispensed, and what a Bishop can impose, a Bishop can undo. I submitted myself to my Bishop and he accepted my action; of course this is only necessary to be done once. In

this way I think the whole matter can be arranged, without running the great risk of making matters worse for the Church in America by forcing the Bishop to take action which probably would, if any doctrine was involved, be unfavorable. If it is a question of jurisdiction and authority and Bishop Eastburn comes before them with an endeavor to get them to enforce his set-at-nought sentence, they will speedily find out that he cannot bind clergy out of his diocese and in their own.

What you say about St. Albans is gratifying. I am glad they are getting on so well. Everything is a gain. Perhaps it is better they have not confession. Are they prepared to receive confessions, do you think? No one should hear a parish who was not in careful practice of the ordinance himself, and I don't think a great many American clergy are fitted to hear them. I hope we shall be very careful, too, of anything looking like a young clergyman's affairs, etc. We have no faculties granted by our Bishops. But it is obvious to any young earnest Catholic priest, that except in necessity it were better for him to wait till his own director should think when, and in what class of cases, he should receive confessions.

When Dr. Pusey returns, I will put your matter to him also, if I get a good opportunity to do so; but I think it will be just the same as it has been given by Neale and Liddon and Benson. It would not require a formal judicial act from a Bishop to

dispense one from a promise which was contrary to the practise of the Catholic Church (if contrary to the faith it is void *ab initio*, so Dr. Neale regarded it). A priest has the power to dispense from rash vows, not all rashly made vows, but vows rash or wrong in themselves — and so I think has in your case. As far as your own conscience is concerned, the action of a Priest is all that is necessary. Bishop Eastburn did not bind you by any exercise of his own Episcopal authority; by authority flowing from the Grace of His office. In such a case a Bishop would be necessary to undo what a Bishop had done. But you bound yourself by a promise. It is the promise that binds you. Now it was not a promise personal. A promise made to, or for the benefit of, Bishop Eastburn. He had nothing to do with it, except to finally receive the certificate. You did not promise Dr. Manton E. that you would abstain, etc. If it was not made to him, during his good pleasure — not a promise to abstain as long as M. E. might think fit. He had no power at all over the certificate. He refused to receive it in any other but the exact words. He was but depositor of it. It was not thus a promise personal.

One has offered himself, whose name in England will command the respect and confidence of all. Mr. Benson is one of the greatest masters in the spiritual life in England. It has made our hearts, viz. Rev. O'Neill, Tuke, and Messrs. Lane-Fox and Wood, etc., leap for joy. Other persons of equal prominence with Mr. Benson are seriously con-

sidering the step and seeking Divine Guidance. The Religious houses are praying for the work, and it has been determined to begin.

As soon as we can we (unless the coming in of others should alter the plan, and it is thought they will desire the identical same thing) will meet at a place near Oxford, Mr. Benson's parish, and commence living by Rule and receiving instructions in the spiritual life and rules of a community. One will act as Superior (Mr. Benson probably, but one or two other persons may join, of great prominence in the church and in holy living, and they will settle it among themselves) and direct. The formation of the fuller rule will not be made till after a year. Persons will go on the continent and visit the Religious houses there. Some have already been staying at Mt. Cassino, other orders will soon be examined. The advice and counsel of such persons as E. B. P., and Keble, Carter, Bishop Brechin, Mr. Liddon, and others will be taken. Father Benson is about 42 or 46, and all such a little thing as myself has to do is to obey. He saw some of us on Friday, and all he said was full of humble, sober wisdom. I cannot detail all the various steps that have been taken in this matter which has been going on for some time, ever since I landed, for I heard of it from E. B. P.

Whether I shall go on the continent is doubtful. My one object is to see Religious orders, etc., and learn. But I don't think it is very important now, as these persons know more than I do, so I may go

to Mr. Benson very soon, and I shall take no step without his advice.

It is gratifying to know that indirectly the Bishop of London will sanction the formation and also no fear is entertained of the Bishop of Oxford to whom Mr. Benson has prepared a letter.

The Rev. O'Neill and Tuke are about my age or a year or so younger, are pious, trained, and very earnest men, who have been praying and preparing themselves for this work for some time. Messrs. Lane-Fox and Wood are gentlemen of position in English society, and make sacrifices to join us

The society will be based on the three vows, of course. The general line will be rather like that say of the modern orders, the Redemptorist or Jesuit, than the ancient Monastic ones. What our fear is, that they may not be worthy and may by pride or self-will, or want of docility or teachableness, be an injury to the work.

Thus I may remain some time longer than at the last I proposed. It seems the way God is opening.

I think you can make Mr. Bishop understand that in a work so momentous as that of a brotherhood, requiring so much of discipline, the worst of all mistakes is precipitancy. All of God's people are disciplined by waiting. Remember St. Paul. The world was waiting for his preaching. The conversion of the heathen would seem to hang upon him more than upon any other Apostle; yet, though burning with zeal for souls, first of all he went out

three years into the desert. Souls were waiting, were dying, were going to hell; yet his duty was to wait, to go slowly, to build not for a day, but for centuries, and even when he began, God frequently stopped him; kept him in prison; sent no angel, as he did to St. Peter, to deliver him, but kept him there that he might study and read and meditate over his parchments, and so be the better fitted for laying the stones of the temple. All of God's saints go slowly. If Mr. Bishop is desirous of our taking his place, he must be content (if it is at all dependent on me) to wait. I may return in the autumn or winter or spring, but just now do not know when it will be. It will depend on what Mr. Benson should direct, etc. You might of course begin there, but I hope the place will not be compromised with the Church, and we have to assume a quarrel which we alone should not have got into. All that you need say to Mr. B—— is, that I am striving to learn about community life, and it is absolutely essential to the obtaining of a needed competence of information that I should remain abroad, and the work will be done all the better for the delay.

The work is looking forward to a house of training of men for the ministry at Oxford, a west end chapel or church, using the intellectual in London, and chapel humane work, etc., among the poor in a different quarter, and foreign missions perhaps in India, and other branches, etc.

Now this being so, I should like F—— to come out

and be trained, if he has a vocation or is drawn to this blessed work and life of sacrifice. Noyes is in delicate health, and the Rule would be too severe for him with his complaint, although sufficient food and sleep is a prominent maxim of Father Benson's. But I don't know whether the routine would be suitable to N., and you say he has also bound himself to another lad, who will require to be supported. I don't know any one who would do, except F——. Moril has his work, and I doubt if he has a vocation for community life, and the discipline of a religious. F—— has some externals which would have to be abandoned entirely, smoking, and drink, but he is not lazy or sharp-spoken or vain or conceited or eccentric or with any deeply engraved spiritual faults.

He has in him the making of a spiritually minded person, if he will try to be such, and put himself under directions. He has his snares as we all have, but might make a religious if he would humbly and prayerfully seek of God the grace and follow the means.

The best thing he can possibly do for his own soul's sake, for the good of the Holy Church, is to come here for a time and start with the others. He will get what he cannot possibly get in America. He will get Holy Men to guide him and train him in the spiritual life. He will learn what cannot be taught by books, but by personal directions. Urge him, dear Oliver, to keep the Rule, to examine himself two or three times a day, to

be careful about little things; to read the rules of mental prayer, and to practise meditations first with, and then the same meditation without, the book. He will also gain here access to books and men and pursue his studies in theology in a way my ignorance of languages prevents me from doing. This we want. E. B. P. wants Catholic truth brought home to intellectual Boston. Some one must come out and study. These great reasons urge the matter.

But the one important, all important consideration is this. Is he drawn by the Holy Spirit? No consideration of self or vanity or pride should influence him. No desire for his cooperation should affect us. Is the Holy Ghost drawing him on. Has he a leaning towards a Religious life? Is he willing to seek of God whether it is his vocation and be willing to follow it? Is he willing for the Love of God and of Jesus our Lord to lose his life in this world? Get him to consider with prayer his needs, circumstances, temptations. His failures and sins need not keep him or any of us back, for the Precious Blood is still open to us. They can be washed away. But is he willing to try for Christ's sake to serve Him in this dark age more fully than he can in any other way? If he will only try, I believe God's grace will surely not fail him. You know him better than I do. He is much abler than I am, and I would like, if it is God's wish, that his ability should be consecrated to Christ. He knows more than I do of some things, and has much

better talents, and would be of more use. If you think he may find it his vocation, urge him, dear Oliver, not to trifle with the drawing of Christ, and the pleading of the Holy Ghost, but to covertly seek whether it is so. He had better take no work in America, but come over at once. I don't know who is his Bishop. Bishop P., I suppose. He could probably be induced to let him come for study here, especially if Seabury would recommend it. I think Dr. Seabury would. There would be no more difficulty about Priest's orders on his return than now, etc. He need not say to any one that his purpose is the religious life. In fact he ought not, but that he is going to study, etc.

With much love and all blessing,

C. C. G.

P.S. If you think it will do any good to them, let F—— see the whole of this. He will not feel hurt by anything I say about him. He knows I love him and his soul too well. Please write soon and let me know what you think about this.

Could not F—— pay you a little visit. Use your discretion about sending him my letter, and bring the matter before him. I feel I am taking a great responsibility in offering any one to those here, but it is certainly due to F—— that he should know of the matter, and if he has a vocation, he will find the opportunity held out to embrace it.

With deep love,

C. C. G.

It is too late to copy the prayer.

LONDON, JULY, 18, 1865.

MY DEAR FAY:

I feel as if I knew you very well indeed and yet did not know you as well as I could wish. You have been very much in my thoughts before and since I left America. I desired to have a good long talk with you about yourself and your plans, if you would admit me to your confidence before I left. Perhaps it is as well, for our talking would (crude now) have been cruder then. You know what I have deeply at heart; the revival of the Religious life. That a number of priests bound together by the closest possible ties, would by their love and sympathy support one another and be useful in the saving of souls, we cannot doubt. Other ways are good. Other men may do more. Other men may not need the restraint and discipline which I feel I do. Other men's labor and lives may be crowned with greater tokens of success. So we are neither to criticize nor condemn other men or the secular clergy, but support them. But the Catholic Church has always recognized the religious life as a distinct estate, and that some either because they were weak and could be used in no other way, or for some reason known to the sovereign will, have been called to it. Have you thought over this matter, dear Fay? Have you considered the question? Is the Holy Ghost drawing me to the life of a Religious? What is His will in my regard?

Now in many things you are a better scholar than I am. God has given you certainly a fair measure

of ability. You don't need my bringing matters before you, which you can show as well as I at least, and reason and develop probably better. I am not learned and have no pretensions to scholarship; but let me bring these things to your notice, which will of course be between ourselves and ourselves only, for other persons are involved and very great harm may be done by hints even and more by talking. I must desire whatever I may say to be regarded with sacred care.

First. A Brotherhood is about to be begun in England. The Religious life, meaning thereby the life based on the three vows, will be commenced. A novitiate of two years will give opportunity to persons to try their vocation. The rules and statutes will be drawn up under the counsel and advice of those in whom we can have implicit confidence. A temporary rule will be adopted during the formative stage. One of the most spiritually minded men in England has felt called to this work for which he has been preparing for years. Others of note and distinction, or scholars and holy men, are gravely considering the duty of joining it. There are already six who are pledged in, and, unknown to one another, others are seeking of God their vocation. The undercurrent is very deep, and the hearts of a great number are being drawn to the matter. The danger is that the work may grow too fast rather than too slow. It is marvelous to find persons in India, Scotland, England, and America are working to one end, and the providential drawings

and wonderful education of each apart is something to make one fear lest by their own self-will, or pride, or ambition, or want of correspondence to grace they may mar in any way the work and design of God.

There is enough to satisfy you in the fact that such persons as E. B. P. and Keble, Bishop Brechin, and Mr. Carter and Liddon are interested in the matter and will give it their advice, counsel, and direction — that and the organization will be such as you can safely, that is, for your own soul's good and the welfare of others, and the good of the church, attach yourself to, if led to the Religious life as your vocation by the Holy Spirit. You and I can trust such persons and safely dismiss all crude plans and ill-digested ideas and find some niche in the work where it will be ours to listen and be taught and learn to obey, and be trained in our calling. Here is the opening.

Then the question which I would ask you to consider is, Has God called me or is He calling me to a life of poverty, obedience, and celibacy? I would be very careful how I suggested this matter to any one; because it involves such consequences to one's self, to the person addressed, and to those with whom he may be associated. There is no more dreadful and galling yoke than a mistaken vocation. The painful, bitter torments of a self-chosen course, whichever way that may be, are most fearful to bear, and make one a most fitting and easily influenced subject to the temptations of

the Devil. The low tone of a secularized mind, a blindness to spiritual things, and the result of rejecting the call to a more self-sacrificing life, are only shadows of the external death which is settling on the soul (which may go on doing something, preaching and teaching and eating and drinking in Christ's presence and casting out devils in His Name even), but which has chosen its lot and path for itself and rejected its vocation. And equally humble, more dreadful indeed, is the awful state of those who seek to enter the Religious life uncalled by God; all are not called. The Saints have been some of them married persons. The examples of some of our best priests and those whose ministry God has blest wonderfully have been married men. One can love God as fully in the one state as in the other is the teaching of spiritual science, and the declaration of the Saints. The trial and care and mortification and humiliation and discipline of obedience and poverty, wholesome and purifying as it is, may be found in the secular trials and home duties and domestic afflictions of the married. The lot of a religious, chosen from aught but the single desire to follow the will of God and embrace one's vocation, will be found one of the most tormenting beds of flames a man can select for himself. One may be tempted to it from a party spirit, from pride, possibly vanity. The love of doing something peculiar; a hasty human spirit resolving in its own strength and not in the grace and strength of God, to do things for Him; a strong ambition or spirit of self-will, etc.

What therefore one should seek is the guidance of the Holy Ghost for purification of right motive. What does He call me to? Let me set before myself distinctly the two estates and understand what the Religious life is. It is Poverty, Obedience, and Celibacy. It is not to work joining a society. Draw this out fully, please. Nor do I wish to join other men together, but am I desirous of embracing Poverty, Obedience, Celibacy for their own sake? Exclude also the consideration, How can I do the most good or be the most useful? This is another fatal snare. We shall be most useful in the place and state where God calls and puts us, and for which He has designed us, and towards which all His providences and Love unseen by us have been tending. If we should do nothing but sit still and be silent like the angels watching Christ's grave clothes, we shall be doing more good than if we were rushing about with all the eloquence of Paul and Apollos combined proclaiming the resurrection. Don't let us be so proud as to think we of ourselves can do anything. We are only doing real good when we are standing in our lot and obeying His behest. Very busy we may be and yet be doing more eventual harm than if we were doing apparently nothing. Doing nothing as the world would count it in obedience to Him, is working in the most effectual way we possibly can for His Glory. Keep then to this one consideration: What is My Calling? Does the Holy Ghost, not self, call me, to follow the Master in this more toilsome way of Poverty, Obedience, Celibacy?

I think that is the way the matter should be approached. Represent well its severity and what it is to be poor, obedient to another man, etc.

Because you may find the flesh and the human spirit pleading within you against such a life. Drawing you away from it; arguing against its usefulness; suggesting your past habits of life as unfitting you for it; claiming as it will that you have only a fancy for it, and the desire for it is only a snare of your own devising, — because you find these, don't misapprehend their source. The question is, Is God; Is the Holy Ghost; Is Christ, calling?

The Blessed potter can make His clay as He will, if it only yields itself up entirely, absolutely, with entire abandonment, to His molding. Do not be guided by any mock or mistaken humility, or cover up the real selfishness and niggardliness and sensuality of the human heart by any such deceit as I am not fitted for such a life. Of course you are not. Who is? But if God calls, he can fit, if we only abandon everything, will, understandings, affections, plans, designs, wishes, everything we are or have, or expect, or wish, every thought and motive, to Him. We need not doubt His Power or Grace.

The greatest care should be taken, lest love of care, comfort, position, the natural unwillingness for hardship, and sacrifice do not lead one into the self-deceit of covering up the desires of the flesh and the promptings of the human heart with the specious deception of humility.

Putting before one then the conditions of Pov-

erty, Obedience, and Celibacy in their rigor, ask we of God guidance that we may know His will in our regard and grace to promptly follow it.

Nor is it necessary to decide absolutely whether it is my invention or is God calling me? Is it my duty to stop, seek, examine? Is it not my duty to try if it is so? If the opportunity is providentially opened, shall I not do so?

Do not ask especially the illumination of the Holy Ghost. Say the Veni Creator as part of your offices. Take such a book on the Spiritual Exercises. Pursue the Rules of Mental prayer. Don't pass directly from one meditation to another. If you are obliged to use the book, then make the same meditation the next time without the book, and when you have made two or three, make up one of your own out of them. Grind them into the Soul. Wait for God to speak to you about the matter of vocation. His voice may not come for some time. Remember that the question is not, whether I absolutely have a vocation, but are the leadings of Providence such as to make it my duty to try to undertake a novitiate? Is it my hope that it is my vocation, and is it my desire to do all I can to find it so and to obey at all cost to flesh and spirit?

I would suggest that you would like such subjects as are in the beginning of the Spiritual Exercises: "The End of Man," Sin, Death, Judgment, Hell, etc., and then others sometimes, "The Two Standards."

I know very little about these things, and you

must allow for many imperfections in this and for my boldness in putting it before you.

If you would come out here, which will be the only way to begin the life, the cost would not be much, if that is the one object in view. I don't know what your means are. As far as the Religious life is concerned, it is of no account. The expense out would be the passage money, and that you could find out on that side. Then here the cost would not be much. We should live all together with the Superior and I suppose at a certain rate of proportionate expense. The fact is in the Sisterhood, etc. money matters are known to the Superior alone. The Novices make different arrangements according to their means, and no one ever knows whether one is contributing much or nothing to the common support. When one is professed, their whole income goes to the common fund. I suppose twenty or twenty-five shillings a week could amply cover one's share of the expense, but if they had nothing, they would be welcome. We Americans are very sensitive about money matters, sometimes wrongly so. If you will tell me just how you are situated, I will make the arrangements for you with the Superior. I myself am dependent on my relatives, who kindly provide for me. Be assured the means will not be a hindrance.

With my best love and prayers and blessings,

Yours very faithfully,

C. C. G.

A Fragment

. . . . . .

It seems to me that it would be a kind of sacrilege to use his name to get money for any other object than one which would really be a memorial of him (Keble). Now nothing is a memorial of him which does not embody fully his principles or else given to some mere memento like a Monument, etc. That we are not likely to have in America, especially from the hands of the Keble Committee, therefore I hope that you will use what influence you have in directing attention to the advisability of sending the money here. It will form another link between the countries, etc. It is not pronounced and likely to frighten any one.

I don't know when I shall return. It depends on what opening I may find. But I may get back in the autumn. What I want to see is a Religious life founded. — But how few are fitted and how few are willing. — It is something not to be played at. One must have a vocation for obedience, poverty, and celibacy — a faith and trust in the inspiration of the order, its rule, and yield oneselves to it, to be made and fashioned by it in all ways. If the Church is to prevail, it must be in the strength of her martyr-life. Her children must pile the Living Altar *with themselves*, and the Light to light again the nations must stream up from Nations consumed in contact with that Burning Heart of Jesus. If the Church is to thrill again with His Divine Love, the

heart of the Priesthood must be *slain* and buried in His heart, having lost in holy obedience all will and wish of its own and beating responsively, acting energetically, in union with the sacrificed life of the God Man. Let us pray that the Church may be quickened with this new life.—That Religious orders may arise.—That Christ may again be with us in all His power and that we may preach the Word in the midst of this adulterous worldly generation in demonstration of the spirit and with power and signs following.—Let us pray for the Spirit to be poured out that the young men may be drawn to and held by Our Lord, that if he should come while we are on the earth, He may find us at least making an effort however feeble to do our best to give our all to Him. When Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit they are created and Thou shalt renew the Face of the earth.

I asked Dr. P. about your certificate. He said you should simply ignore it.

1. When a diocesan affair.—That Court could only bind within its own jurisdiction. The sentence affecting the practise elsewhere was void.

2. The certificate was signed under the request of another Bishop for the purpose of effecting a transfer, Bp. E. having declared he could not alter the word of the certificate given by order of the Court. That is, the words in the certificate were beyond the Court's power, but Bp. E. could not alter the words; it could only be done by your signing at the order of another Bishop.

3. Bp. Wh's. official communication, in teaching you that he regarded it as of no force or account whatever, *released you* and *settled the matter.* A Bishop can undo, etc.

4. Besides you are now in another diocese and received by your present Bishop without any limitations so expressed in your letter dimissory from Bp. W.

C. C. G.

If you were still bound, he, Bp. Wh., ought to have *noted it in your letter dimissory.*

Bp. Williams supposed he was receiving a Presbyter capable of exercising all the functions of his Priesthood.

NOVEMBER 3RD, 1865.

DEAR OLIVER:

I am still waiting to hear from you and know you are proceeding in the best way and will let me know when the time comes. I write to ask you to obtain some pamphlets on the work of laymen in the church written by Mr. Walsh of Philadelphia, a well-known person.

I have neglected this matter for some time and therefore feel anxious about it. I don't know his initials or address or would write myself and not trouble you. Please obtain them as soon as possible and forward by post to William I. Garnett, Esq., Quernmore Park, W. Lancaster, England. He was in Parliament last session, a man of nerve, etc., I think. I promised to get these for him and have delayed writing for some time. I think Mr. Walsh is a member of the General Convention.

And another thing. I am to give a lecture for Mr. Carter (in quite a modest way) on the American Church. Will you not do me the kindness of procuring for me some good account of Nashotah? It is the only very church-like thing I know of. Any facts concerning it. A note to the Principal would do it. I sent him a donation from home last year, and I want to have something about Lloyd Breck, and the Indian Missions; I am asked about these. Anything else that occurs to you to send, do so.

Pamphlets are expensive, if over two ounces in weight. So send them singly. The postage is an English penny for single pamphlets under two ounces. But is sixpence if over. In sending matter, I tear it up to save postage, if it does not hurt.

We are getting on slowly. Provost Kortescue has lectured twice here in Oxford on the Religious life. There will probably be several houses formed in time. The society of the Holy Cross has had an order of Celibates for some years. I preached at All Saints at the first Vespers of the Dedication festival.

With all love in Christ,

C. C. GRAFTON.

TO FATHER PRESCOTT

. . . . . .

Be careful what you bring out in print, but you must begin to do more in that way. Don't frighten people. Don't say peculiar and startling things. Don't try to win people by making them open their eyes. It is a worldly style of

rhetoric, and does more harm than the mere good of attracting attention which is gained thereby. But speak the truth in love, and in the sober-mindedness and sobriety of speech and bring it out. You must not be a friend of your pen. Don't be ambitious; write simple things. But write.

I remember what you said about mortifications in one of your letters. I believe they are useful. Inward ones are far more telling, but the others have a use. If you come out for a couple of months, you can get what things you want here. It is a rule in one of the Sisterhoods, for a sister, if discipline is to be taken, to go to the Mother to get the instrument so that they do not keep one and use it themselves when they will, etc. You can have anything made here, you wish — hair shirts or belts or steel belts or anything, but it is something one keeps to oneself entirely, and has only a limited range of usefulness. A little something persevered in, is a help.

You spoke of your constitution. I have fallen upon several passages of devout writers holding that God often times gives them over, when persons are in a low state of grace, to draw them on; while from others more advanced he withdraws them. But it requires a good deal of experience, courage, and determination of will to discern between the consolations of the Holy Spirit and those which arise from the natural man (or the human spirit). The devil may also tempt one through the care with which their bodily and spiritual temperament is sensibly affected by devotion. By the way (you know

how I hit out) you said in one of yours, that some "thought you were a considerable preacher." Let your preaching and mine take care of itself. Don't let us care what people think. Try not to let your mind rest on the effect of your sermon. Don't imagine how this or that person would take it or how they would regard it, or what they think about it. Whether they would agree with it or not, when it is done, leave it to God and exclude the subject from your mind. We shall have when we get together, if God so will, to be very careful what we say to each other about each other. Let us help one another to leave our work to God by not yielding as I have often done to vainglory and committed a multitude of sins by indirectly talking about myself and my sermons and yours. I am writing as you see without any plan, but this came into my head and illustrates how one's attention is directed to the details of life and speech by weekly confession, such an expression would have to go into my weekly budget of sins, etc., — so if I looked in the glass — was unrecollected and spoke of self, etc.

I have written to send the inclosed. Clayton and Bell have some work in Albany for Mr. Prince. They are spoken very highly of. If Dr. H. wants them, he had better write for a design. I should try to have the best style.

With much love,

Yours very faithfully,

C. C. G.

P.S. I should like to know about New York as a place for trying. It would require two or three priests. One to sing, etc. Can you tell me how the old church of the Incarnation stands? Is it for sale?

To Father Prescott, 1865–6

. . . . . .

He had no more authority over it than any other Bishop after it was made. To whom then was it made? It was made by you in *conscientia* to God. It was then like any other promise not having a personal relation to the promisee, and it being also not one of the reserved cases requiring a Pope's or a Bishop's dispensation. It remains in the exercise of the ordinary confessor to dispense from it. So it seems to me.

I will write you again about the glass window and get some more information.

Dr. Harwood may not know that the U.S. authorities have lately decided that there is a distinction between ordinary stained or enameled glass and works of art and paintings on glass. Paintings imported in good faith for religious societies incorporated, are free of duty, which in other cases is thirty per cent. The new window in St. Luke's, Baltimore, was consequently admitted free of duty as a work of art. I will write in a few days about this. A window filled with medallions or quarries, would not, I presume, get in free of duty.

If you can procure a copy of the *Church Almanac*,

I want one for the list of American Clergy contained in it.

My sister has written me from New York. I think they are much more anxious to do something in the church way. I think God will order for us.

Do try to come out for two months; it is expensive, but worth it, to go to Dr. Pusey.

With much love and many prayers,

Very faithfully in our Lord,

C. C. GRAFTON.

TO FATHER PRESCOTT, 1866

. . . . . .

I got some good suggestions from Dr. P. The best, that our work should be principally directed to the youths and young men.

We should take a temporary rule for a few years and then form a more permanent one.

The members of the society should be in the habit of confession. No one should be permitted to take vows unless recommended by his spiritual director, and upon his knowing by a general confession his whole life.

He thought we had better begin where we were going to establish ourselves in Boston or New York, and not commence in any other place such as Bridgeport, and he preferred Boston to New York. It would take some time to write his reasons. You will be careful, dear Oliver, not to mention any of these things (to any one, to Mr. Bishop, nor to Noyes, or Fay, or any one living) either that Dr. Pusey has

seen me, or said anything on the subject, or what his views are on these matters.

The Doctor's knowledge of parish matters is not so good as any working parish priest (say Morgan Dix), and he knows comparatively little of America. His opinion was based on some things which I told him in answer to his questions. He liked B. on account of the university being near, and our work he wanted to be a work with young men as one of its special objects, or its special object, and he did not like commencing elsewhere, because he did not like moves.

I have seen the Bishop of Brechin, and I think that he prefers a modern to a monkish order. Mr. Chamberlain gave me much information. He is an admirable and practical person. His view was that we want an order like that of the Society of Jesus. This is my own view. They form a body of parish priests. And if one is to do such work, you cannot be confined, as the older orders were, to the repetition of so many offices publicly in choir; but must say them privately, and in proportion as you are obliged to give up something of the severe asceticism of the monk, and wear other clothing and use not so severe fasts, in proportion the inward, mental discipline of obedience must be practised to a more severe and exact extent and the voice of the Superior be to us as the voice of God.

NEW COWLEY, OXFORD, Feb. 7, 1866.

MY DEAR OLIVER:

I have just time for a line. Will you not write me a letter and tell me (1) how you feel about coming out here for a short time. (2) Whether you are still of the same mind about going in together for the formation of a religious order.

Thinking over your last caused some question to arise in my mind as to whether in anything I had offended you, or whether you had altered your idea about the expediency of going in with me. Mr. Rankin has written me asking me to join him and take charge of the Sisters and to share in the spiritual matters of the parish.

I can't give an answer now, as Father Benson is away, and I know F. B. would also ask me about my own view of the matter, etc., and that depends somewhat on what my good friend O. S. is disposed to do.

I have always trusted you with all my ideas and plans, and never can allow anything to disturb my love for you. I told Dr. Pusey that some, I hoped, would go with me in America, but I could certainly rely on one. He is much interested in the plan.

Being left alone, I have followed what seemed the leadings of God. We have had a sea of troubles, and my life is one of much anxiety. I have been for months engaged in the Roman question with several persons, and doing all I could to keep them to their duty. Our own experience helps us. One

(a fine Cambridge scholar and priest), I was much blest in saving, and went down to the Jesuit College after he had gone there, and at last brought him away. But these things take up much time, involve long letters, journeys, and much anxious thought. My life has been one of constant priestly work. Therefore, I am giving a Retreat now for the penitents here in the Oxford house. I shall go to Prestbury to preach a Mission for the first week in Lent. Am having my hands full.

Our Title is: Mission Priests of St. John the Evangelist — for short, The Evangelist Fathers.

I should like to consult you about many matters. I spoke the other evening with Dr. Pusey and Bishop of Brechin. There seems to be little hope just now of doing anything in America, but I trust the Good God will let me be an instrument of His using, for the main of His Glory, before I die.

With much love and waiting for your note with much anxiety.

Yours, etc.,

C. C. G.

Would Dix go in for anything like an order? What is your address? I did not receive any pamphlets from you.

NEW COWLEY, OXFORD, February 21, '66.
Care Rev. R. M. BENSON.

MY DEAR OLIVER:

I have now yours of the 5th. To-morrow I leave here for some twelve days, and send you this brief line now. Your letters were like your own self,

and could not but affect me much. My own inner life, that which no one but God saw and knew, was so bad that I used to be in long seasons of dreadful despondency and mental pain. How little indeed we can know of one another. There has seemed to be a double current in my life. My efforts have been increasing, but then when a fit came, it seemed worse. I have been plunged into despair, I have lain down on the floor in Baltimore and wept, and sometimes for months I loathed the sight of a prayer book, and prayer was repulsive to me, and I would give up for days the saying of my prayers, and I thought once I would give up the ministry altogether and live a worldly and sensual life. But it had to come to the same thing; God in His dear goodness would not let me go; somehow He has kept me. I must commence again. God does not give me up. I must humble myself more. I must dig deeper, as the words are of St. Simon "Stylites." I must be "gutted," as the work builders say when they come to restore a house. God meant to make me cry out to Him as one sinking into hell. And now I think I see a filthy, humble, loathsome object in me, and which is me, my old self, ready now to leap out into a filthy, private sin, unstable, angry, petulant, self-conceited, intensely vain, and proud, covering up its hypocrisy and meanness in itself — and now I know, if God does not keep His Strong Hand on me, I shall be just as bad as before. I am simply a dung-hill and cannot help giving forth a stench. I I cannot trust in myself or believe in myself at all,

and I pray Him to take me out of harm's way; out from my own power and diversion out from myself, to lift me up from the mire; to wash me in His own Blessed Blood and then hide me in His wounds. Take me away from myself and hide me in Thee. I desire His Heart for my chamber where I may dwell and in which I may be sheltered and my cloister where I may walk.

What has helped me more than any previous thing has been Confession. The power of the evil seemed broken since I went to Dr. Pusey. I did not so feel it at the exact time, but it has been so, and I pray and ask you to pray that it may continue unto the end. I have had more comfort and peace and light than ever before, and power. The Dr. is very good. He said, "I am old enough to be your father, yet there is no sin mentioned in the Old or New Testament, I have not heard." Confession has shown me the terrible power of sin, but the more wonderful power and goodness of God. I hope and pray that you have by God's good providence the same blessing.

And, dear Oliver, I would kneel down before you and tell you all my sins, and you must know how long and heavy the catalogue is. It is certainly a struggle with me how to go to Father Benson with my smaller sins. It is as hard to self sometimes to confess a little act as a great one. But I believe God is leading me on, and as the Good Mother at Clewer told me, "The soul God has begun to lead on, He will

continue to lead on," and will be still further on, etc. His Heart has depths which time does not fathom. He will reveal more and more of Himself. It will be a continual revelation. He will lead us on and on, whithersoever the Lamb goeth. But the human spirit must first be crushed and broken.

But I should only say what you know, so I go to your letter.

It seems to me a very significant moving, that the door of the Church was shut. Thank God for it. It would have broken my heart, if anything of that kind should happen to you. You have no idea what might in such a state have been the consequences, and if there is one thing I am thankful for, it is that God has kept me from cowardly abandoning my post where He placed me. The sin of going to Rome is now very different from what it was twenty years ago, and I see how great it would have been for me. Archbishop Manning says, "Leave the raft and come into the ark," but it seems to me that the high priest here unconsciously acknowledges what he thinks not of.

If there has been a raft made, it must have been because there has been a shipwreck, and one is safer on the floating raft than in the sinking boat. His illustration is not, I think, a happy one for himself. Our position is a trying one. One may have many waves rushing over him, but it is most blessed and safe. Dear Oliver, we must do all we can for Christ. The time of his coming may be nearer at hand than we imagine. If

you have duties to your sisters, and if your lot is to care for and protect them, God will help you to do it and can bless us wherever we are and in what ever part of the vineyard we toil. But if it is not necessary and your duty, come with us. Tell Mary about it. Your sister Mary is too advanced a Christian woman not to be willing to give you a little in this world for the blessedness of an added glory hereafter. I wrote to America saying I thought I should get back this summer. See if you could not come early, before the long vacation begins (the last of May). After that Oxford is empty and Dr. Pusey away. If you could come out in the spring, we could return in the autumn together. Traveling is very expensive, but settling down here in Oxford is not so dear as in New York. I live for one pound a week.

I will consult about the Certificate. In fact, I had thought about it a great deal and some time ago asked Dr. Neale's opinion, putting the case, but not telling the name. He held it was not binding, because contrary to the teaching of the Church. But it is a very complicated question, and wants looking into.

It never occurred to me that you promised not to teach and inculcate that a priest had the power to preach confession I thought it was, not to hear confessions and give absolution.

We none of us can agree, not to teach any part of the faith. We might promise as Priests not to exercise the power of the keys, because of course

it is common for the Bishop to license only certain priests to hear confession and give absolution. I think the Bishops will look at the matter now differently. They have given us absolution as well as all other things.

I should think most of what Dr. Pusey said on such a point. He is so up in all common law, etc. Mr. Carter is very, very cautious. His mind turns a matter inside out. He looks at a question from all sides and is so slow. (Has a lovely way I suspect of teaching me, by asking information himself.) He would look at it in its moral and spiritual aspect, and if he thought it might be broken, I should act on his opinion without any hesitation.

Thanks for all you have said. We have here a daily celebration, with which I have devoted almost all my time. Remember me to your sisters, please.

Yours, with much love and prayers,

C. C. G.

P.S. I wrote to Mr. Rankin saying it did not seem to me to be in my line of dealing, to go to St. Luke's, as I had begun this work and I could say nothing further until my return.

NEW COWLEY, OXFORD, Wednesday, March 14, 1866.

DEAR OLIVER:

I have your most welcome and cheery letter, and should like to have time to answer it more fully than a few minutes before the post will let me do. When I return in some ten days, will write again. My Lent has been the most busy one I ever passed. I went

to the Bishop of Oxford's Reading Mission, from there to Prestbury, where I spent over ten days; occupied nearly all the time, from thence on to St. Raphael's, Bristol, where on Wednesday I began a Retreat, which lasted till Saturday. It is very exhausting and a great mental and spiritual strain. God has been with me, I feel, and blest the work. On Saturday night I got back here and preached on Sunday. On Monday found myself hoarse, but am rapidly toning up for my work, which commences again to-day. I preach at Littlemore to-night, at Cowley to-morrow. Go to Bumpton on Friday, and on to London Saturday, where I am to be at St. George's Mission for eight days, assisting at a Mission there. Preaching twice a day, etc. In Holy Week, I expect to get back, and have but one appointment as yet. I have no time to write sermons, and until I get back to Cowley very little for anything else. I enclose you a St. Raphael's paper; please keep. "The Meditations on the Way of Sorrows" are the Stations which hang round the Church.

I am glad you wrote to Harrison. It is well to sound persons who seem as if they might be drawn to a religious life. But what, of course, we must look for is, does God draw them? Is it their vocation?

I think one special mark is, a very deep conviction of sin; another, a spiritual perception of what the religious life is. Something desirable in itself is a special means of likeness to and union with Our Lord.

And one should be told of all the trials, humiliations, bores, in a churchly way which will come upon one.

No man can come to me unless my Heavenly Father draw him. I don't wish to hurry or urge persons to come. I don't want any to come on low or secondary considerations. It may be a long time before the light dawns into the heart of the soul. We must wait and pray for it.

Suggest to Harrison to pray more, to pray for the Church and for himself. God must give the enlightening. What he does not now see, he may by the grace of God by and by, and what the will of God is; it is not the question of being an extreme or an advanced man or belonging to an advanced party or views. It is not an intellectual matter, but the work of the Holy Ghost. Personal sanctification should be his great effort. If he will strive for that, long for it, pray for it, watch for it, fast for it, take discipline for it, deny himself for it, put his dear Lord crucified before him as the model of the priest; he will do more for his parish than in any other way. This truth, dear Oliver, seems so little taken in, that if we are priests, we are also likely to be Victims. The terms Priest and Victim cannot be disjoined. The Priest must offer up himself as his Lord did, a whole burnt offering, and expect in every way to be crucified. We are to preach the cross, from the cross. We are to be saved not merely by the Cross; but being on the Cross, the Cross saves us.

I thank you for all you have written. God will also lead you. If he sends you a call to come, He will open the way. When the Master says follow me, He will provide the means. Wait on Him and tarry His leisure. I feel about the call to become a sister or a religious, that it is a call of God to two parties; the parents to give up and offer their child in sacrifice, and so doing they will be blest beyond what they look for if they do it in that Holy Spirit, and the call to the person to come to the Altar. The sacrifice is to fall on father and son and to be shared in alike, and both to be blest.

If you see Morgan Dix, have a talk with him. I know he is cautious, but not more so rationally than Benson or Mr. Carter, etc. My plans are merely daily ones, and so I live on; if God blesses me here and uses me, His sweet will be done. We have but one life here to live, and I pray him to take mine and do with it what He will.

With much love,

Yours in Deo,

C. C. GRAFTON.

You know we have the daily sacrifice. I have been without it but few days since being here. When I get a good opportunity, I will lay your question of conscience before Father Benson and Dr. Pusey.

New Cowley, Oxford, April 2, 1866.
Easter Monday

My dear Oliver:

I received your comforting folio of journalizings Easter Even, and it could not but add something to the great joy of the great feast. I shall be so busy to-day and to-morrow that my reply may not extend to your own gracious length and must be magnified in your sight by your good love. The letters have all your own true ring and fire about them. Let us go, dear Oliver, together if the Lord will. He may place us apart in our outward work, but we must run both of us together to find the Body of Our Lord. One cannot find out any new spiritual blessing or receive any new light or power from God, but one desires to share and impart it. To bid others taste and see how good the Lord is. If we commit our way unto the Lord, He will bring it to pass. I want more faith. I hardly realize how utterly wanting in that spirit that leads one to venture on the tossing water, to make ventures involving perils, I am. Father Benson has tried to make me see that one is not to do the Lord's work so much as to utterly give oneself up in a crucified, crushed spirit and complete self-abasement to let the Lord do with one as He will. If we are absolutely surrendered to Him, He will accomplish His will by us and through us and in us to the sanctification of our own and the wills of others. But I must stay my pen and not preach as is so apt to be my wont.

I think I may have told you my decision about Baltimore. When Mr. Norris was here with Mr. Wilmer of Philadelphia, I was asked if I would have St. Mark's if called, but all that kind of work can be done by others and does not fall in with my present line of duty.

About your certificate. I consulted last summer Dr. Neale, who as I wrote said it was not binding because contrary to the faith. No one should promise that he would not teach and inculcate that a Priest has authority to pronounce absolution except in two cases. All resolutions contrary to good morals, etc., all promises against the Church's faith and practise, are void. It is a sin to make them. There may be extenuating circumstances in any individual case. But when one has found out he has done wrong, the only way for dutiful children of the church is to put them aside. It is the reparation for the wrong done.

I do not remember Dr. Neale's words, but he said the resolution was not binding and one ought to break it. He seemed to have no question about it, nor had Liddon. I saw him on the subject the other day. He thought one ought to repudiate and no longer allow one's self to be bound by it. My question to them was, What should one do who had signed such a certificate and desired to be relieved from it? He said: "One should inform his own Bishop that he no longer intended to be bound by it. A person so doing did all he could. The certificate was wrong and illegal in itself and he

should violate it and free himself from it." These are not the exact words, but this the meaning. If one has made a promise he no longer can in conscience keep, the course for such a person to pursue is to notify his own present Bishop of that fact and to say he can no longer keep it. He thus submits himself to authority.

Tuesday, May 8th, '66.

My dear Oliver:

Last week I was very busy with the Retreat which I gave to the All Saints Sisters. I feel that I am learning a good deal myself by thus being brought into actual connection with the work. It is one thing to look at it from without, and to go through a house, and to read their rules, etc., and to come personally into connection with the system as I have been permitted to do. Father Benson would train me for a Mission priest. It has its own dangers and temptations and its own hard work. I did once fear continually lest I should break down in my meditations, which shows how little faith one has in the sustaining power of God and how utterly forgetful of self one should be. I have been in the practise of confession myself every week since August (before that not so often), but I come out from such a Retreat as that I have just gone through feeling that if by God's goodness He has used me in any way as an instrument through which to speak to others, He has also made them to whom I have ministered, lessons to myself. I saw privately a

large number of the sisters, and as is customary most took the opportunity of not making the mere ordinary confession, but wanted aid in their spiritual course based upon a somewhat fuller knowledge of themselves than such a manifestation would enable a priest to give. Mr. Carter gives a Retreat this summer, and I pray God to give me grace to humble myself before him.

The All Saints Sisterhood has quite a strict rule, yet the Bishop of London is visitor. It is a stricter rule than that of Clewer in some respects. Each of the leading sisterhoods has its own characteristics. There were several of the Clewer sisters present. If the sisters of one home cannot make their own retreat with their own house, etc., they go to some other; there is a kind feeling between them. You, I suppose, have little idea how careful one of these persons gets about little things, and how recollected and devout many of them are. I have reason to believe the Retreat was a help to them, and hope I may go away the better also. I am now quite at home at All Saints by going and coming so often. I am to be up here on the first Sunday in Trinity and preach the yearly sermon in behalf of the Sisterhood. God seems to have opened a work for me here, and I am busy all the time.

Dr. Neale is not expected to recover — but may last a year or two possibly. The Bishop of Brechin has a mortal disease and can do little comparatively. It has been going on for some years. Liddon is a delicate man, and his health is not very good. Pray

for them. Dr. Pusey is well, but felt the loss of Keble very much. The letter to him informing him of Keble's state was four days on its way, and he did not know of the event till it was over, I believe. How beautiful was the statement of Keble's, during the time his mind was wandering. He seemed to be dwelling on the Church and Her future. "Whatever prayer book the whole church puts out, I shall gladly use if I be thought worthy." Why don't you preach a sermon on Keble? Please send me a copy or two of your Benedicite sermons.

. . . . . .

August, 1866.

I am going down to East Grinstead to the funeral of Dr. Neale. I will try to send you any papers containing an account of him, that you may prepare a sermon. He died on the morning of the Feast of the Transfiguration and is to be buried on St. Lawrence day.

May God keep and guide you and bless you and lead you to the doing of His will at once.

With much love,

C. C. G.

P.S. It is no matter about "openings" in the United States. You wrote about some church up the Hudson. I think when I return (D.V.) I shall begin in New York, or God will then show me where. If I only had a room, I should commence in that way and not in any at present organized parish, and I have no fear about the future, if we had the men. If you are called to this life, then you must leave

your parish, and all plans, and come out here and do what you are told. What is more easy?

Yours with much love,
C. C. G.

Act on this as a call from God and in obedience to His commands. Let me see you in September if possible.

NEW YORK, Oct. 1st, '67.
Tuesday

MY DEAR OLIVER:

I have just received yours of the 26th, and write lest you should come to town this week. I think it best for me to run down to Long Island to-morrow and see my brother.

My visit to Baltimore resulted in two applications to join the Clewer Sisterhood. One I think will go out next May. The other may possibly go out this trip. One I never knew before, and the other I had not thought of.

I found no one to join the brotherhood. A Mr. T., a student of Theology who was mentioned to me, was away and also Mr. Ward, the assistant of St. Paul's. Perryman called to see me, but I think he has no wish for the Life. When I think of the state of the clergy, it is very deplorable. Johnston, Styer, Gilson, are married. I had two long conversations with the Bishop. He is much opposed to the present ritualistic movement. The state of things in Maryland I think dreadful. It is a state of spiritual coma. The opinion of all the clergy I talked with was that the church was retrograding. During my visit I went out to Cretonsville, and saw the

O. B. U., and to Reisterstown, and saw Dr. Rich. He will, I think, get some of the clergy together next year for a Retreat. I went to the East Shore on Friday night and remained there till Monday evening, when I came on here. Mr. Levin was glad to see me, and I preached all day for him. He has an altar approached by three steps, two lights and a cross on it, and celebrates in an alb and linen chasuble. The Bishop has stopped the lights at St. Luke's, and the colored stoles. I tried to tell him something of the result of the present course of Episcopal action in the Anglican Communion, but could say very little indeed to what I wished to do. My visit to Maryland resulted in this: that while there were not a few who would enter a Sisterhood, there were none who would go along with me. The Bishop's opposition makes me decide to leave Baltimore out of the question for the present.

Do not be troubled about yourself. I hear the confessions of Father Benson and O'Neill, but I think it would be much better for you to go to Father Benson, as I do myself.

If you came back here, you would have enough of me; his direction is too valuable to lose.

As you are already under a vow of celibacy, you have only to live up to it. You cannot go back from that, and entering an order will aid you to keep it. As to your returning; I feel that it will be absolutely useless for me to attempt anything in this country without four persons to begin with. It will be only to begin with a certainty of failure to

do anything else. Even then I feel I shall take my life in my hand, and five or six years will finish me, or I shall give up, or succeed. We want strong men and men of prayer and holiness of life. I feel how utterly inefficient I am every way. It is only because the work is impossible that one has any hope about it. It is madness and folly, or it is of God.

I am going to give a Retreat next week to the sisters here. It will commence on Tuesday evening. I hope to get back here Saturday evening, and will preach on Sunday.

I really think it would be better for you to go out to England, and to leave the question as to your return to be settled out there.

Yours very faithfully in our Lord,

C. C. G.

Have you any intelligence from parties connected with the Baptist church? I think it would be admirable.

Dix said that persons must not suppose us poor if we started, etc. That is dependent on them.

Please give me Dr. Forbes' address. I must go to him before the Retreat next week.

To Dr. Oliver (*a parishioner*)

December, 1877.

Dear Friend:

I happen to have a few moments to write, and so send you these thoughts.

I. As to those who have left our Communion for Rome.

You ask whether the argument we used does not prove too much, and de-christianize that great branch of Christendom?

I think not.

The point we were considering was the validity of Anglican Orders and Her Sacraments. Romans deny we have them. My experience shows me that they who come to the Church from other bodies where according to our belief they do not have (save Baptism) Sacramental Grace, manifestly grow in holiness. They show the same kind of marks which betoken holiness, as those stated by Roman Catholic writers to be the true ones.

Next, I have learnt from the acknowledgments of those who have gone to Rome, by the witness of a large number of persons who have known the lives of such before and after their secession, and by the obvious fact of the falling away on the part of some, that, taken as a whole, those who have left our Communion do not exhibit that great and striking change in sanctity which they ought to do if they had no Sacraments before going to Rome, and have them after. On the contrary, although it is not material to the argument, the mark on the body of the converts seems to be that of a declension.

On our theory that we have Sacraments, all this is easy of explanation.

We do not de-christianize the Roman Church. Those who are born and brought up in her, have the Sacraments and profit by them. Those who have joined Rome from other bodies than our own, come

for the first time under the influence of Sacramental Grace, and improve if they use it rightly. Those who come from us *had* the Sacraments before, and we do not see the great change in holiness in them which we ought to do and which it is incumbent on the Romanist to prove *exists*, on their theory that they have Sacraments and we have not.

My belief is that having left the place where God's providence put them and where they had the Sacraments which they disowned and denied in leaving, they have sinned against Grace and laid themselves open to temptations, and so, as a body of men, have on the whole declined in Grace. But all that is necessary for our point is this: If the Romanists have the Sacraments and we have not, then those who go over from our Church ought, as a body, to show unmistakably that they have gone into quite another sphere of Christian life, and there ought to be a marked and unmistakable increase in sanctity. And *that* they do not even claim to be the case.

II. Certainly your reference to Exodus is suggestive. But there is a distinction between the Jewish people while *in the wilderness*, and the establishment of *the Kingdom in Canaan*.

The first is like the time when Our Lord was teaching the Jewish people, leading them out and forming the Church; and of Him Moses, Aaron, and Joshua are the types; and the second like the time of the establishment of the Kingdom on the Day of Pentecost.

Moses, Aaron, and Joshua are types of our Blessed Lord as the Head of the Church, respectively — as our Prophet, Priest, and King. When the Kingdom was established, then there was to be no visible head — the Lord was to be their King; and the very sin of Israel was that of desiring to have a visible head. Instead of keeping the Jewish Nation together and being a source of strength and unity, it turned out to be the cause of division. It was an earthly, carnal, worldly principle and power. Such was its result, and Christendom has fallen into the same sin, I believe. It desired a visible head, and the result has been the division of Christendom. Dr. Foulkes, who was a Romanist many years, a very learned historian, has brought out this view in his *Divisions of Christendom.* He returned some years ago to the Anglican Church.

III. We will leave the other matter till we meet. But consider this — *Is* the Pope a "visible" head any more than Christ is? We have never seen him, that is clear. And it is physically impossible that he should be seen by all Christians on earth. And again, if I say to myself — *but he teaches* — there is this difficulty. How are we to know *when he teaches ex cathedra,* and when he does not? The Roman Theologians have no common criteria to settle this. There are a dozen views — Newman taking one, Ward and Manning taking another.

Yours truly,

C. C. G.

Thursday, 1880.

DEAR MR. OLIVER:

I am glad you came just as you did, and asked for what you wanted. It is a mark of courtesy that assumes another would do as you would yourself.

Come at seven on Tuesday. I am nothing of a "controversialist," and I don't want to "proselytize." If I can help any soul to know Our Lord better and be better united to Him, I am willing to do so. My own experience sometimes enables me to do so. But I don't wish to force my own views on others.

What I would advise any one to do is, not to let the mind get worried or over anxious about the matter, and never to act on any impulse or in time of depression.

Your motive is right. God will show you His Truth. In order to recognize it, the important thing is to purify our wills and have humble hearts. We shall then not be led into any mere system or organization, but the apprehension of truth will be one with our union with Christ who is the Truth itself.

I don't think Döllinger would say what you quote — now. Does it not sound like an attempt at explanation which the exigency of his old Roman position demanded?

Yours very sincerely in Christ,

C. C. GRAFTON.

Letters Relating to the Withdrawal from the Order, 1882

My dear Father Prescott:

I have ordered the Living Church to send copies to all the clergy in Philadelphia and New York cities.

Will also send to Mr. D. Will you please give me his full address?

Bishop McLaren writes me to-day a friendly letter. He feels strongly the necessity of Autonomy, etc. I think he may have something to say in print by and by.

Have to-day written clearly to him, stating the principle, how it has practically come up in our society. Father Benson bidding a Rector to resign in order that he may put in an Englishman who would be practically a curate of his, and believe he is able to do this; because if you don't obey, you will be crushed, and no harm can come to him, for Western Bishops will receive the English Clergy who leave, etc. I put it better more terse.

I also wrote Bishop Seymour. Gardner is full of courage. He says as soon as the matter is seen, you will have sympathy.

When you get to New Haven, don't read. Take a good deal of quiet. Take a good deal of quiet out-door exercise. Get a walk and go to bed very early, and get some fresh air just before going to bed at 8: 30. At first you won't sleep, but I think you will by and by. Get to bed early and lie in bed. When you begin to worry, whistle a little. It makes one laugh,

and laughing is a Divine Institution, sadly neglected in Religion.

C. C. G.

November 5th, '84.

My dear Father Prescott:

I was sorry to hear what I did from Father Gardner. Why cannot you leave Ripon the first of January for six months, and come here and let us start together?

Father Gardner's objection makes me fear that he has rather lost heart in the Life, that strikes me as forcible.

I am willing to trust Bishop P. with the visitorial power he asks for. He ought to have the right to enter any institution in his diocese claiming to be a church institution. If he is to give his official sanction to the society, he ought to approve of the public office books of the society. To say the enforced prayer of the society are private prayers; or this saying of office, by a church society, is like the prayer of a family which has no official character, is a subterfuge. I think the Bishop is right in this respect, and practically it will not alter anything. He is willing to sanction the Day Hours. Go about the House Rule even if we had the S.S.J.E. rule, no Bishop who was not crazy would object to it. All that Bishop Paddock's amendment on this point touches, is the Bishop's power in his own diocese, and the society might have its own Uses in other dioceses.

Father Gardner seems to think we should have to change when any new Bishop came. This is shying at an imaginary shadow. No Bishop would ever demand more than Bishop Paddock, and once started, if one Bishop wanted to withdraw from the council, it would not hurt us, but rather damage him.

The real change proposed by Bishop Paddock's amendments, as I altered them, is to give the society a National character, and put it on a far higher plane than we dared to hope for. We could select our own council of Bishops and have an indorsement such as no other society can have. If we miss this opportunity, it will be a sad loss. It is the grandest opening presented since the Reformation and worth all we have been through to establish it. But we must act at once to secure it. Father Hall is not coming back till the Spring. If we start now and at once, we can do something.

If you could come here for six months, I think we could begin. If God prospers us and means come in, we may see the way in a few years to give up the parishes and find some house in the country, or to our having one house in the East and West. This God will provide for and direct us in, if we follow Him. I am bound to the Life, and in some way mean to have it. We came out from the S. S. J. E. not because we meant to give up our Religious life, but because F. B. would not carry out his agreement. If we fail to come together, the world will have a right to say the accusations against us were true.

I am sorry your letter has gone astray. Perhaps God does not intend you to stay this winter at Ripon, but come here.

I am working very hard. Next week have an address to give the Evangelical ministers of Boston, and the next day go by the Bishop's invitation to Pittsfield for an address. I leave Sunday the 16th for Baltimore for a Mission there with Sword.

On returning shall begin a series of meditations and Bible classes. A little book I have written on Plain Suggestions for a Reverent celebration of the Holy Communion, is in press and will be out next week Wednesday. I have promised a mission at Newport in Epiphany or the Gessimas. Before the year '85 is out, I mean, please God, to place the sisterhood of the Holy Nativity in various cities, and want you to work for it.

With love and prayers (hoping you will put aside all technical objections and come here and practically work out the problem).

Yours ever faithfully,

C. C. G.

I think Benedict wants Gardner to go to Briar Cliff.

An American Religious Community

August 15, 1885

It is because some who have authority to speak in the Church have asked me to write something on the formation of an American Community of clergy and laymen, dedicated in the Religious Life, which

will aid their brethren having parochial charges, that I send this letter to you. Though having now more than twenty years' experience in this country and in England in connection with Religious Communities of both men and women, I yet feel that one's views on such a subject should be put forth submissively to the greater wisdom of the Church, and as liable to be corrected by it.

It is noticeable that, in any portion of Christendom blest with a priesthood and Sacraments, and thus fully organized for its work, great religious movements are usually accompanied by the formation of societies of persons associated together under various rules of Christian living. The Life of Christ manifests its power in an increased desire of conformity to itself. Souls, as by a heavenly illumination, catch sight of the inner principles of that Divine Life of self-sacrifice and are brought by a divine call together in order the better to make those principles their own. This has been the case in both the Latin and Anglican Churches at various epochs of their history. The freedom allowed to individual action in the Anglican Communion has led to a large number of separate efforts, which, as organizations, have met with various degrees of success. Some, because they neglected the Church's order, or through the mistakes attending all new efforts, or because they were not needed for the Church's present work, have failed to attain permanence. Nevertheless, at no time has the presence of the Holy Spirit more certainly manifested itself than in our

own day by the revival of the Religious Life in our midst.

It is said that Cardinal Newman has in the Birmingham oratory a picture of Oxford, crowded as it is with the towers and spires of its numerous churches, and underneath this symbolized representation of the Anglican Communion has written the words: "Can these dry bones live?" Lacordaire declared that the Religious Life was the fairest fruit of the Catholic Church, and only where there was a true priesthood and Sacraments could it be found. And now, after these many years, the answer comes from a hundred houses and a thousand "Religious" that the English Church is indeed a true branch of the Church of Christ, and that the highest developments of Christ's Power and Life are seen within her.

Much has been done in America; the Sisterhoods of St. Mary, St. John Baptist, St. Margaret, St. Barnabas and others, filled as they are with many bright examples of the Life, show how the American women have responded to their Master's call.

As regards orders of men, while something has already been accomplished (for which God be thanked) yet, as the aspirations and counsels of many devout persons show, there is room for a society different from any now working in the Church and one not engaged, save temporarily, in parochial work. In such a society there would be a place for clergy of various talents and also for highly educated and devout laymen. These latter would not occupy

the place of lay brothers in the society, but would have on profession the same privileges as the clergy. Such an association wisely formed could do a great work for God by its life of study and prayer and by aiding the bishops and clergy in their missionary and parochial labors. Its life of sacrifice and entire self-consecration would witness to the Church's belief in the unseen world and the power of her Sacramental gifts enabling her sons to reject honors and wealth, and live above nature. It would help to dissipate the spirit of worldliness and self-satisfied respectability which hangs over the Church like a miasma poisoning her life. It would, by its constant intercession, ceasing not day nor night, bring a blessing on many a lonely worker in his labors and make the whole heart of the Church beat quicker with the answered gifts of grace. It would throw open to all the clergy a place for short periods of retirement and prayer for their own spiritual refreshment, and aid them in their parishes by supplying preachers for the Church's seasons of Advent and Lent, by giving retreats, quiet days and missions, and by taking charge temporarily of vacant parishes or missions which the bishops might wish to assist.

And not only within the Church could the influence be felt. In our country the contest between Christianity and unbelief, righteousness and evil, is obviously deepening; and the realization of this makes the spiritually minded of all Christian bodies look somewhat anxiously towards each other. As the net breaks, the toilers beckon to their partners to

come and help them. If our Church has anything of value to contribute she must show it, not on paper, but embodied as a life. A Church on paper, like a Christ on paper, will as little affect the world as the surpassing beauty of "that countenance which is fading on the walls of the refectory at Milan." If the Church is possessed, as she claims, with special Sacramental gifts of grace, the Life of the Incarnate Lord within her must show itself in lives specially conformed to His own. A society of sincere, unselfish, humble-minded men, unostentatious in their piety, seeking no honors, giving up all for Christ and laboring for Him alone, would effectually aid the Church to manifest this Life.

Never in any age or country was there a greater opportunity to serve Christ. Never a portion of the Church where a few, even without great natural gifts, could do greater things for Him. More clergy are indeed needed everywhere and nothing here said must be taken in disparagement of the Church's wisdom in giving us an Order of married parochial clergy adorned as it is with devoted and noble lives. But the Religious Life is no revival of medievalism. It has always existed in the Christian Church. It is an integral portion of her life. The Church is not fully equipped for her work without it; wherever in any portion of Christendom it has been wanting the Church has suffered. It was instituted by the Lord Himself. Like the work of God, it has been at times greatly perverted and misused, but its perversion is no disproof of its divine origin.

The Master Himself gave the counsels of perfection and said: "He that is able to receive, let him receive it." The counsels unite the soul in a special way to Christ, and the Religious Life becomes an instrumentality for the extension of the divine energy latent in the Life of Christ. It has a power, when in a community form, different from that which comes from organization. The world can make organizations and is ever, in and out of the Church, weaving and unweaving them. A Religious Community is a special work of the Holy Spirit manifesting the Incarnate Lord's triumph over nature, testifying against worldliness, witnessing of the unseen glories of man's coming union with God. Preaching the cross from the cross, it draws men to the Master with an efficacy all its own.

And if ever the constraining force of redeeming love called men to this Life, surely it does so now by the unparalleled splendor of the opportunity for effective service and by the agonies of the Church as she gathers her energies for her last great conflict with evil. Shall we not see a fuller development of this Life in our Church? Will not the prayers and the sufferings and the sacrifices of so many who have waited and labored for this consolation of our Israel find a response?

It is not the hardness of the Life, though far less than that of many of our western missionaries, that will deter Americans from entering into it. The American clergy are not cowards, they are as patient of discipline for any recognized good end as any

nation, and are not wanting in devotion to their Lord. What others, what Americans in the Roman Church are doing, what women in our Church are doing, they can do. The sacraments are as full of grace to us as they were to the saints of old. It is an infidelity to our Blessed Lord to say His grace cannot make, or but rarely, Americans "religious," and that they can succeed only when mixed in with a predominating number of another race.

The reasons why those, not held back by worldly-minded considerations or whose position has not been already determined, do not seek this Life are for the most part such as these; men do not realize the importance and value of this Life to the Church, or they have become engaged in some Church work and think they are necessary to it, or they do not know whether they are adapted to the Life and feel they cannot trust themselves, or they have not seen the Life presented in a form which attracts them or commands their confidence.

It may help any really seeking to know God's will, to meditate on the fact that this Life, like that of the priesthood, is the product of a divine call. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." This call to "Religion" is the exercise of our Lord's sovereignty calling whom He will, however weak or feeble they may seem to themselves, away from any work in which they may be engaged, however important. The call is at once a warrant and a pledge. A warrant for one to come, and a pledge of help. It is an assurance that God will provide

for all He calls us to leave, and that He will give all needed grace to sustain us in the Life. He betroths the soul to Himself in *an* espousal, taking it "for better, for worse," and will never leave or forsake it even if it should stray from Him, but will seek it out and recover it, and claim it for His own.

As to the character of a society which shall win the confidence of the Church and attract members by its wisdom and unselfishness and by reflecting the love and beauty of Christ's crucified and risen Life, in an article like this only some general principles can be stated.

I. Such a society *must not be an imitation or attempted reproduction of anything in the past.*

This has been a source of failure in some cases. One clergyman in England tried to revive the Franciscan Order; another has tried to reproduce the Benedictine. In neither case did any of the clergy unite themselves to them. It was suggested by an able writer in your paper not long since that a type would be better found in the Oratorians. This was Dr. Pusey's advice to the writer some twenty years ago. There is much to be said in favor of such an idea as relates to the interior life and discipline; but, so far as the general government is concerned, it is a bad model for us to follow. A society formed of independent houses, without a central novitiate, would among us soon develop great diversities of practice and life. No! To succeed in the America of our day the foundation of a society must be the work of the Holy Spirit working in our Church and

producing that which is needed for our own times. It will not be an imitation but an original work. It will not be the work of good men enthusiastically experimenting with holy things and so sure to fail, but of those called of God to the work of founding a society, and through whom He will speak. He will speak and His word will endure. For "His word shall not return unto Him void but shall accomplish that whereto he sends it."

II. The society *must be an American one.*

The Religious Life does indeed lift us above all nationalities unto Oneness in Christ. In any society there might therefore be found men of all countries and kindreds working harmoniously together. But the Religious Life does not lift any above the Church's order or make any superior to its law of jurisdiction. It has been said that the religious vows are superior to a priest's ordination vows; but such a theory would, I hope, be almost universally rejected. A society in our Church, therefore, cannot legitimately have its head in another Church, whether Greek, English, or Roman; if it does, the inherent disregard of the Church's order will eventually show itself in some disaster.

III. Again, if a society is to succeed, it *must grow out of the real wants of the Church and be able to meet them.*

Now there are several departments of service requiring associated clerical labor. Such a work is needed in our large towns in attacking the sin and destitution found therein in certain localities. It

is needed in certain missionary districts in the country for the extension and planting of the Church. It is perhaps needed in the special work our Church is now being called to do among the colored people at the South. These useful labors do not, however, necessarily require that the workers should be organized or dedicated as "Religious." The work can be done as well by clergy simply associated temporarily together in clergy houses. This fact, so far as city needs are concerned, is clearly seen by the efficient work done in London, at All Saints', St. Alban's, St. Peter's in the East, and many other places. It would be a help for all such clergy to be under some rule of life as the associates of some Religious Order, but not to be full or professed members. For it may seriously be questioned whether the experiment of trying to combine the needed discipline, hours, study, poverty, recitation of the many Offices, etc., of a Religious house, with the care of modern parishes or with city missionary work is not a mistake. But let this be as it may, there is a clearly recognized need of a society removed from the daily care of parochial charges, whose members shall give themselves to study and prayer and to the assistance of their brother clergy. Some of the ways in which such a society could afford assistance have been previously stated. The point here we would insist upon is, that such work needs an Order of "Religious" and can be well done by them alone. It needs men unharassed with parochial care, and so able to live in their own house undistractedly

their life with God and free to go out at the call of others.

IV. Further, a society formed for such work *should have Episcopal approval.*

When clergy combine under rule and obedience, and form a society, they become a power in the Church, and the Church has a right, if it sees fit, to legislate concerning such societies. Apart, however, from the question of legislation, if such a society wishes to be established in a Churchly way it must seek Episcopal approval. In the Roman Church, as is well known, any tentative effort may be begun with the approval of the diocesan authorities; but to obtain further recognition it must receive the approval of the Holy See, which is only obtained after a long and patient examination of its proposed constitution and rules by a body of clergy whose special business it is to have charge of all matters relating to Religious Orders. If approved, the society is first allowed the rights pertaining to a "congregation," and is so-called. After many years it may obtain the further privileges of an "Order." In the first case, though approved by the Church, yet any Bishop may decline to allow its entrance into his diocese. Without being in some way established by the Church, the society is a merely human one, and the authority of its Superiors is such only as may be granted them by election. In our own communion there has been, to speak with loving plainness, an unwillingness on the part of some of the advanced school to trust the Bishops. This

arose partly from a feeling that the Bishops were out of sympathy with everything Catholic and would persistently confound it with Romanism; and partly from the natural self-will of the reforming spirit that wants to give a lesson to its brethren in poverty, chastity and obedience, but does not propose to begin the lesson by giving up its own will. So the difficulty of a Superior not having any Churchly-derived authority has sometimes been met by saying that he is directly called by God and so should be obeyed, in all things not obviously sinful, as God's voice. There is involved in this, the danger pointed out by our Lord of following some man and calling him Master; and which led to the rise under ascetic and devout men of Arianism, Calvinism, Wesleyanism, Irvingism, Swedenborgianism, etc.

Now the Episcopate is a divine order, and to it especially the government of the Church has been intrusted. The divisions of Christendom do not make the voice of any Bishop of less authority who honestly seeks to express the faith and practice of the United States and the law of his own communion. If God trusts the government of His Church to the Bishops, we also ought to trust them, and a society in its various stages of formation should seek their counsel and approval. Until the latter has formally been obtained the society is not formed and established. The answer to the question what should be submitted for such approval and what such approval is to cover, is: all that by virtue of

the rules and practices of the society is of *obligation* on its members. No Bishop can give his official sanction to a society simply because he approves generally of its life, purpose, and work. His recognition must mean more than this to be of value, and all that it covers should be submitted to him.

V. It is not for the sake of gaining any, the least, favor from those who are opposed to the Religious Life as such and the doctrines of Sacramental grace connected with it, but because an open and honest avowal of felt dangers is the best way for their removal, that I would state the next principle to be that the society *in its teaching should be loyal to the Church.*

There should be no other standards of doctrine than those of our own communion, and these should be recognized as such in the constitution of the society. This is necessary, not only to command the confidence of the Church, but for the protection of the society itself. The Church should feel assured that the society has no occult objects, political or ecclesiastical; is not seeking to bring in a foreign theology or to undo, if that were possible, the work of the Reformation. The priests of the society should feel that they were not to be committed by the extravagant utterances of individual members, and also were free from the dangers of being moulded by some one powerful mind to peculiar views and so become the vehicle of a new theology. Seeking to present Christ as the power of God unto salvation, delivering the sinner from condemnation by the

merits of His precious blood, and saving him from his sins and raising him to holiness by His life, the doctrinal statements of the Book of Common Prayer and the Sacraments are sufficient for the purpose. To such a society, loyal to the Church, broad in its sympathies, true in its life, practical in its teaching, the doors of churches of various schools would be thrown open, because their Rectors would feel that their parishes would not be upset by peculiarities, or galvanized into spasmodic activity by sensationalism, but the presence of such missioners could not but bring a permanent blessing.

VI. If they are to be men of such a character, it is obvious that the society *should have its own definite spirit.*

A Religious Society is not an agglomeration of Christians, each pursuing his own spiritual fancies, but one having, as part of its own divine call and foundation, its own religious spirit. For societies differ from societies, and Orders from Orders, and in nothing more are they seen to differ than this: their vows and the spirit of devotion they embody. In the Roman Church some societies have only simple, and under certain conditions, terminable vows; others allow of vows of a mixed character, vows of profession intentionally for life on the part of the offerer, but without agreed permanent acceptance on the part of the society; in others, the vows are solemn with a stipulated power of dispensation reserved to the authorities of the society, or remaining with such stipulation of power only in the Pope.

In some a further vow "of stability" is taken, which binds the member not only to the Life, but to the Life in that society only. In some the support of the interests of the Holy See forms another vow. They differ also greatly in the emphasis put on the separate vows — one making poverty the chief feature, like the Franciscans; another, like the Jesuits, emphasizing obedience. Now as to vows in our own Church, without stating here more fully the provisions and conditions under which they might be taken, yet, as in every case in the Roman communion, it should be under the implied condition of a power lodged somewhere whereby for grave cause one might be wholly or partially relieved from his obligations.

The societies of the Roman Church, especially the modern Orders, differ still more in their devotions. One Order will be devoted to the cultus of the Sacred Heart; another, to the Passion; another, to the Blessed Virgin, and they are named after these devotions. In the English Church some of this tendency may be seen. Now in respect to the spirit of devotion, what it comes to me to submit to the kindly judgment of those Bishops and clergy who may sympathize with any effort for the establishment of a community, is this: it seems fitting that the spirit of a society which, like our Lord's Life, would be in its labors both contemplative and active, and which should go out not only to win souls to Christ, but to build them up in Him, should take as its special devotion, and seek a special conformity

to, the interior Life of our Lord. Not to any one portion of His Life, but the whole Life, hidden, public, suffering, and risen. It seems wiser and safer to look to Jesus alone, to Jesus only, to Jesus entirely, to Jesus wholly, to let the loving and divine Heart be the source of all our grace, the inspiration of our actions, and the model of our own. This will give an interpretation to those counsels, upon which the life of all Religious Communities is based, peculiarly its own. We are called not only to follow Christ laboring and suffering and winning His way to the establishment of His Kingdom, but have by the Holy Spirit been incorporated into union with a risen and triumphant Lord, whose victories participating in we extend. The society in every part of its rule will not only have the cross inwrought into it as a principle of life, but will be possessed with the gladness and peace of the Resurrection and the brightness and joy reflected from the Glorified Lord. The Life will not be one of that depressing asceticism which seeks to attain Heaven by its own holiness, or its members be trained to become corpses, dead to everything but the will of a Superior.

If the Life unites us to His Spirit of chastity, Who on the Cross cared for His Blessed Mother, it cannot be such a spirit as would make us dead to all human affection. We cannot learn to love God more by loving man, for whom He died, less. The purity God delights in subdues nature by grace, casts out selfishness, purifies the motives, makes the inward eye single, inflames the heart with a supreme,

obedient, effectual love to Himself. It binds the "Religious" in a wedded bond of union to the Lord as her spouse.

If the Life joins us to the Master's poverty, Who not only was born in the poverty of the manger and the carpenter's low estate, but Who voluntarily abandoned home and family and had no place whereon to lay His Head, yet the poverty need not array itself in dirt or neglect the laws of health, or be any more ostentatious than His own. The practice of Religious poverty must indeed be true and real though different from that that was practicable in simpler and ruder times. There will also be a real hatred of worldliness in all its forms; — the seeking to gain its wealth or influence by the accommodations of Christian conduct to its standards, or that transplanted worldliness which gives up personal ownerships but seeks to acquire wealth and power for one's society. If poverty is true, its motive will be the love of Jesus. Jesus poor, Jesus scorned, Jesus destitute of earthly power, Jesus rejecting an earthly kingdom, Jesus triumphed over by His enemies. It will be a love which will bind us to His self-abandoning repose on His Father's care and protection. It will be an extension of the victory of His choice of the cross over all the proffered glories of the kingdoms of the world.

If the Religious Life binds us to Christ, Who, from infancy to His cross, was bound by the swaddling bands of the Father's will revealed through human instruments and the written Word and the

Spirit's leadings, it is not such an obedience as will on principle seek to "crush the inward mind and judgment." Wherever a Superior orders that which is obviously morally wrong or is against the Church's law, he thereby terminates his own authority. The Superior should represent the Church, and govern by a rule She has approved. He should be aided in the determination in all the important matters by the advice of a council chosen by the brethren, and he, whose lot it is to bear rule, should be among them "as he that serveth." When the heart is emptied of self, Jesus will be recognized as standing in the midst, and in His heart as in their true Centre all wills will be as one.

CHARLES C. GRAFTON.

CORRECTION

Jan. 16, 1886

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BOSTON POST:

SIR, — Justice to others interested compels me to ask you to insert a further correction to some remarks made lately in your paper in which my name was mentioned. It is true I am no longer associated with the clergy who were formerly my assistants, and who are known as the Cowley Fathers, or the Society of St. John, and who are now holding services in the building on Bowdoin Street as a private chapel. It is due to all parties to state that the separation between the clergy, formerly working together, took place, not from any personal difference whatever, but came from a difference of principle

between myself, along with all the other then professed American fathers, and Father Benson, of Cowley, the English superior.

It is to be noted that no society had then been formed by the adoption of a constitution or authoritatively established by the Church's approval. In this condition of affairs Father Benson had come to claim and exercise such power in our Church as our bishops informed us invaded their rights, and which for many other reasons was such as no loyal American clergyman, in obedience to his ordination vows, could conscientiously give.

Our English brethren, knowing our reasons to be conscientious, proposed that we should withdraw, and we felt obliged to submit this proposal to Father Benson. Father Benson released us (not from our obligations as religious, but) from any obedience due to himself, writing us that in going out to form our new society he "hoped God's blessing would be on us as on St. Bernard when he went out to found Clairvaux."

The American fathers, leaving their English connection, maintain as before their religious status, and, although prevented thus far by poverty and other circumstances from living together in a common home, continue to act and work together as religious, and were lately engaged as such in the Advent Mission in New York.

C. C. GRAFTON.

Plans for a New Order

To Father Prescott:

. . . . . .

I think perhaps with the statement below he (the Bishop) would allow the word "promise." He made use of an expression that showed he was willing they should be as strong as the ordination vows; but has an idea that a vow implies a form of oath. There are vows and vows.

The third matter was the release from the society. I pointed out Art. V., which allowed the Bishops to come in. He would like, without seeming to suggest to the professed, the matter of leaving, yet to provide it, more carefully. At the end he expressed himself as generally pleased with the tenor of the constitution, etc.

To-day the Bishop has returned to me the constitution with his suggested emendations. If we assent to them, we shall have his indorsement, and I think he also will say so publicly in his address, which will also be condemnatory of theirs.

His emendations as I have looked over them are of two kinds: 1. Verbal ones. 2. Then those which affect the subject matter. The verbal ones, on the whole, are excellent, and decided improvements in some places. The other relates to the points I have mentioned. When you consider his attitude, I think you will say — though one cannot like everything — that this is for Bishop Paddock something wonderful.

With love, yours ever,

C. C. G.

I will copy all those parts of the Constitution which have any proposed changes in them and send it to Gardner. It is a three days' mail between you and him; so we two are a little nearer to each other. I hope you will write him, and if by God's grace you can see your way to accept the proposed emendations, we shall be in a right position before the country and before the church and God. A position of great influence for good. We shall have really done what for years we have been trying to do. What has never been done before in the Anglican Communion. We shall have established an order of this church.

Thursday

My dear Father Prescott:

This morning I returned from New York, where I went Monday night to preach to the students at the Gen. Theo. Seminary in the chapel at evening prayer, with the permission of the Dean. Dr. Buel received me and read prayers. The Doctor made his allusion to some events which occurred a few years ago.

I find yours of the 29th of December and of January 9th, and hope this will find you and Father Gardner together. His letter on the subject of our proposed communication to the S. S. J. E. was a strong and sensible one, and I enjoyed it. And he pointed out some things which ought to be guarded against if we write, as I am inclined to think it would be well to do.

It is and has been on my mind that I told you what

F. H. said to me of poor Jardine. It is difficult for any one to erase the unfavorable impression made by hearing such a statement as Father made. I wrote out to Sister M. about it and have discovered the source from which Father derived his information. Sister M. spoke of the person as a "semi-idiot" and wondered how a sensible man like Father could have put any reliance on her statements, etc. Another person said the same. It is a matter now of no account, but it should not be assumed that Jardine was guilty of the charges made against him, in all particulars at least and to the extent alleged because his end has been so tragic. His conduct and conversation when with me a few days ago was most edifying in every way.

I have got through writing a book on "Sisterhoods," which I began in August and have put it into Young's hands for publication. It was begun with the intent to write a book which would answer the questions often made me about our Sisterhood of the Nativity and how one entered it. Having got on some way, at the request of the Mother, I altered its character, and made it general in its application with no reference to ourselves; so it came to be a book on Sisterhoods, their organization and government, work, rules, life and with special reference to the matter of vocation. It is written for the benefit of aspirants, parents, clergy and those outside, telling them some of the details of the life, and answering the usual questions exteriors ask. It has been written with much care and I think is very

interesting, and the best thing I have been allowed to do for the church. It will be a book of about 170 pages, I think. There is to be an English Edition, and Masters' name will be on the title page. I suppose it will be out by the first of Lent. I look forward to your reading and liking it, as to a happy day and encouragement.

There is a little matter also of parish news which will interest you and F. G. The communicants of the Advent have started a petition to the Corporation. It is very calmly and ably written. I have not a copy of the petition, or I would send it to you. It states the wish of the communicants for some representation in the governing body of their parish. There are now five or six vacancies in their body, which when full consists of twenty members. The communicants request that they may be allowed by vote to fill the vacancies, and put in five members, and so fill the corporation. If allowed so to do, they will go on and finish their church which in the present state of things, and without representation, etc., they cannot be expected to do. If their petition is granted, they pledge themselves to the corporation to raise $6000 in thirty days to complete the Tower and Baptistry. I have not put the matter as it is written, but I am told it is admirably stated. It will put the opposition in a difficult dilemma. If they refuse, there will be a good ground to go to the Legislature; if they accept, and five new men are put in the corporation, a revolution is accomplished and their day of power is over. I believe the peti-

tion will be signed by all the get-at-able communicants.

With my love to Father Gardner and yourself,

C. C. G.

BOSTON, May 19, '87

MY DEAR FATHER PRESCOTT:

I write on a venture, not knowing where you are or how to get at you.

Father Gardner told me yesterday he was going back to the East the last of June. The idea that we are not going on together, or not seemingly so, is a hard blow to the Mother, a hard blow to her faith in our church.

I am willing to resign here to-morrow if by so doing we can become organized, and you and Gardner think I ought to do it. Father Gardner thinks he can wait as well out West as here, and it is very trying for him to be here.

I have written to a clergyman to come for July, etc.

What I shall do in the autumn if you are not coming back, I do not know. Everything regarding the future of the Sisterhood is most bright, and the two societies might grow up strong and be a help to each other.

I am going to Augusta, Me., to-morrow (Saturday) for Sunday, and do some work there at St. Catherine's School, and shall be back here the middle of next week.

With loving regards,

Yours faithfully,

C. C. GRAFTON.

Wednesday, June 1, '87

My dear Father Prescott:

Let us fear nothing, hope for everything. I believe God will let us carry out our Religious life to the profit of His Church yet. Though everything fails; and it is the fourth watch of the night, He won't fail us. My heart grows stronger with increasing difficulties, for the impossible is God's best opportunity.

I have had very little talk with Father G., but gave him your letter to read. I think he had got an idea that you were not coming back. It would be well to let him clearly understand you did intend this place to be your spiritual anchorage, until we could all sail westward together.

I thought we were all willing to wait here for a time, next spring being in our mind. I am quite ready to make a move, for I have no attachment to the Parish which holds me. Only duty has kept me here, and that duty of waiting has a limit. I am not to make a Providence of myself to the parish. If in a reasonable time things do not change, I must act, on the grounds that the Religious Life is the first consideration: but I want to tell you what the master proposes.

I hope to get to Chicago next week, as I wrote you.

Yours affectionately,

C. C. Grafton.

Boston, Saturday, June 18, '87

My dear Father Prescott:

Having considered the matter of duty, which you and Father G.'s action has raised, I make this final proposition to you and him.

If you are willing to organize by this autumn, I will come out to Fond du Lac, and we can all take our vows publicly in the Cathedral and assume the name of the Society.

According to our Constitution, I can be allowed to remain here, by your and Father G.'s consent, until we agree that the changed condition of affairs allow of a termination of the relation.

So with Father G.'s newly undertaken work at Plymouth, we can agree that he take it.

It will be necessary that you and I should be together, as I wrote you. You to come by the 1st of September, and remain till July or at the least till January 1st.

We can then together get up our Rule and prepare for western work. You can return to take charge of the associated Mission there, while I give myself more especially to the Sisterhood.

I have to be in St. Louis for a long time in November with Father Gardner, who has consented to take part with me in that Mission.

If this plan fails, you force me to act on my own account; you and Gardner having made arrangements and left me.

I must not longer remain in my present condition and must either join or start a society. I sent this

to New Haven as well as Fond du Lac. Hoping you, having received the remittance, will come on to your nephew's wedding.

If you accept the plan, then (I suppose you are referring to the autumn), let the deacon and other persons come on here. Act as you think best, if you want to bring them soon.

With affection, as ever,

Yours faithfully,

C. C. G.

July 28, '87

My dear Father Prescott:

This is just to acknowledge yours and say I am glad to hear you are in Boston, as Mr. F—— tells me you now are.

I am giving Meditations and Instruction on the Rule and Constitution to the sisters who are keeping their Rule here and are in a semi-retreat. The Mother is gaining in health.

Our chapel (it is in an old farmhouse) is a low room and the altar is small, but the sisters make it bright with wild flowers, and show their cleverness and ingenuity by many household contrivances.

Father—— sent me a post card the other day, and a friendly greeting. He has his Father's Rectory. Says he may come out next year. His address is, Coningham Rectory, Stanford-Le-Hope, England.

Yours faithfully,

C. C. G.

P.S. Mr. C—— has written a letter, to-day received, that he is not coming back.

Sunday

My dear Father Prescott:

Arrived here Friday night. Feel anxious about you and the Bishop (J. H. H. Brown). May God preserve him to the Church. May He have you in His dear keeping and in all you do.

I am not yet quite over my cold. Miss M. writes me that Father Luke Rivington three Sundays before his reception is said to have preached very strongly against Mariolatry. I don't think in sincerity. I can understand how in a state of questioning, sometimes our clergy speak more strongly against Rome, to try and reassure themselves.

The mad criticism thrown against him, is that he had become secular by the life he lived at Cannes and his visits to the Aristocracy.

I think if one loses sight of the unseen portion of the Church of Christ, and His saints and the nineteen centuries of believers with whom we are one, and looks only at the little tiny portion of the Catholic Church which happens to be on earth and its divisions, he may be carried away, one side or the other, by the "Lo here, and the Lo there" arguments.

Father Benson seems "quite crushed and seems to have been so astonished and taken aback." He spoke of it last Saturday at a meeting of the All Saints Bombay Association, and a lady tells me, "He certainly did not make light of the sin and, poor man, warned us against worldliness." The Pope honored him by giving him the Blessed Sacrament. His

brother and Mrs. Frank Rivington rushed off to Rome to try and stop him, but it was too late. "Father Benson could hardly be heard to speak on Maunday Thursday he was so crushed."

I saw the Reverend Superior of St. Mary's in Baltimore, who gave me two hours most courteously, going over all the Rule, hours, books, food, house, etc., and letters to one of the Superiors of another house, etc.

Yours in haste,

C. C. GRAFTON.

January 1, 1894

MY DEAR FATHER PRESCOTT:

It is a very blessed work you have undertaken. Gardner and myself were talking about it the other day at Nashotah. We never meet but we speak of you. We know you would so enjoy the sight of the new buildings along the Bluff of the lake, with the stone cloister 226 feet long, and opening into the chapel, which adds to the vista; yet we have often said, if Father Oliver was here, his suggestions would have been invaluable. Nevertheless, you would be able to appreciate in spite of any deficiencies the wonderful transformation. It is like a new place, with the old spirit back in it. The Professors live together and with the students. It is about the only place where Ritualism is not talked about. There is a spirit of reality, order, devotion, and study about the House. I have thirteen and Bishop N. fifteen

candidates together. Wisconsin is the fourth for its number of candidates.

The enclosed I send with sincere regret. But it is only an outward severance. May God bind us all together in the bonds that cannot be broken.

With my prayers for your new work,

Very faithfully yours in Christ,

C. C. G.

April 26, '97

My dear Father Prescott:

I send you my Easter greetings and my best wishes for yourself and your work.

I did not intend going to the Lambeth, but I received a notification from the Archbishop of Canterbury that I had been appointed as one of the four speakers on "The Relation of Religious Orders to the Episcopate." I felt after that, that I ought to go.

But I was also requested to consult with others interested in the subject, and so among others I very naturally ask you to give me the help of your wisdom and wide experience. I wish I could help to better relations between these orders and the Bishops, but there must be a spirit of accommodation, and is there not a difference between Clerical orders and those like Sisterhoods? And how about clergy and different National churches, etc.?

I shall be glad if you will write me, both for its value and also as coming from yourself.

With my regards and good-will,

Your old friend, C. C. Fond du Lac.

Letters to a Young Priest

March 11, 1890

My dear Son in Christ:

You are getting a number of calls. I think some one whom I have disappointed, must put up others to call you. My own counsel is to follow Abraham's choice and not Lot's, to prefer the wilderness with Moses than the riches of Egypt. To let God do His work through you and not seek to do your own or any one's. For by these many calls, I see God has a purpose for you here, which it is in the interest of some other powers to hinder. What it is I know not now. God will surely show it, if we go on together. I know the field is poor, and may look barren, but here is the opportunity for the miracles of faith. With all my heart I believe God has a purpose for those devoted Catholics who will stand by me, and if we do not desert our posts, we shall do a work in a few years which will be a blessing to the whole church. Please tell your correspondent, you prefer to stay here with me.

I will give you notice of my visit before long. How I should like to see you. May our Dearest Lord bless you and yours,

Ever faithfully your father and Bishop,

C. C. Grafton.

Fond du Lac, Tuesday, November 19, 1892

My dear Son in Christ:

You had better decline taking part in the union service on Thanksgiving Day. I want to cultivate

a friendly relationship with our Christian brethren. There will be other opportunities and ways of doing this. I have, when a Presbyter, taken part in services on certain occasions, where ministers of other religious bodies were present. One reason why I would not go out of my own church on Thanksgiving Day is that the church has appointed a special service for that day. It is not like some National Day, appointed by the state, when with obvious propriety all Christian teachers might come together, but a Festival appointed by the church to be kept whether the state appoint it or not, and with its own office, and you want to teach your own people their duty concerning it.

If there is a Fourth of July service, or the opening of a school, or anything connected with the state or town, there would be no such objection. And as you have a matter to settle with your Presbyterian friends, I think you should decline.

Yours faithfully, etc.,

C. C. GRAFTON, FOND DU LAC.

PROVIDENCE, November 10, 1895

MY DEAR SON IN CHRIST:

I should advise the penitent you speak of — to save regularly and to put it in some one's keeping for the purpose of restitution. When his purpose was proven by regularity of payment — and had been listed — then to give formal absolution.

When say — half had been raised — then if you had control of the money, to let some one, either the

priest or some other priest, go to the Insurance people and pay it, either making terms, or not, as it might seem best. He need not go to the same Company.

Yours in Christ,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Fort Pierce, Florida, Saturday, 22nd

My very dear Son:

May our Blessed Lord be your comfort and consolation. The dear little one has been saved from so much. The good Lord has adopted him into his own school of development. He has made him a playmate about the steps of His throne.

Do not be troubled about me. I think I will stay on about two weeks, and then go elsewhere. I am well cared for. My cold hangs on and does not improve.

Do not come hither. This east coast is windy and weather is such that colds are easily taken and hard to get rid of. We have often fire both in morning and evening.

I have the service to-morrow. Don't come to this east coast. I wonder if it is warm anywhere.

With my love and blessing to you and Mrs.——,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

39 Riverside, Monday

My dear Son in Christ:

My stay East has been prolonged, not, I hope, without benefit to the Diocese and the Cause.

I have spoken to the C. B. S. and Catholic Club in these Eastern towns and go to-day to Providence.

Tuesday and Wednesday there are meetings and services of the Catholic Club in Boston, and I am to be present.

Yesterday wrote a short article for the *Churchman* on the retaking of our proper name. It was inspired by Bishop Doane's address. Did you see the vote of his convention? It was ninety to twenty-one in favor of a change of name.

Next Sunday I am to be present by invitation of Bishop Tikhon at the consecration of the new Russian Orthodox Church here in New York. Then have taken passage on the following Monday for Fond du Lac.

Yours with all Blessings,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, July 1, 1911

My dear Son:

Thanks for your note on board ship. We have and shall continue to pray for you daily.

There is a Rt. Rev. Dr. Beals in England, whom possibly you may come across. He was formerly a Roman priest, joined the old Catholic Bishop Matthews, was consecrated a Bishop by him. Broke with him, I believe, on account of his (Bishop Matthews') attitude toward the English Church. He has applied to me for position and work. I have no place to give him and should be afraid to accept him and introduce him as a Bishop in our country.

I pray God to protect you in body and soul, and

give you loving wisdom and grace, and forward all your work for Christ in His church.

Your father in Christ,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

A Letter to his Candidates for Holy Orders

The Cathedral, Fond du Lac, Lent, 1892

My dear Son in Christ:

It was my expectation to have seen you and all my Candidates and Postulants this Lent, but I have been unable to do so, and in place, send to you all this circular letter.

Naturally, you will at this time, by special prayers and meditations, be striving to deepen your own spiritual life and get a more vigorous perception of your vocation.

It is a special act of love for God to call us out, not only from the world, but from the ranks of ordinary Christians, to become associated with Himself in the awful dignity of His Priesthood, and to become living examples, by the transformation of our characters, of the reality and power of Divine Grace. You are hereafter as Priests, to be associated with Him in His tremendous work of saving souls from the power of sin and delivering them from its thraldom. You are to take part, as soldiers of Christ, in the great conflict which enlists on one side or the other, all the powers of good and evil in heaven and earth. In union with Jesus Christ and through the power of His spirit, you are to save souls from being eter-

nally lost, and to train them in holiness for union with God in glory.

There is no dignity so high, no responsibility so great, no work so noble, no reward so blessed, no life more full of beatitude, than that of a faithful Priest. It is a singular mark of God's predestinating love that He calls any of us into this association with Himself.

What I want you to make as the very fiber of your whole moral and intellectual nature, and to become stamped in on your mind and burnt into your will, that you will at all times be governed by it, is this fact, that your success as a minister of Christ depends on the conformity of your life to His.

We are not merely teachers of truths, who perform our office chiefly by preaching. We are not like men of other professions, whose success may not be affected by their lives. Our success in delivering men from sin and making them holy, depends on the extent of our own *self*-victory and our own increasing sanctification. Natural abilities, learning, powers of speech or administration, make men popular. They help men to get on. They bring the reward that will perish. But they are not the sources of the Priest's real strength. To draw others to Christ, the Priest must be a spiritual magnet filled with divine energy. To deliver others, he must have fought a terrible fight with the world, the flesh, and the devil in himself. To win others to a real self-surrender, to a life separated from the world, he must himself be separated in life, aims, and

conduct from it. To make men willing to submit to the mortification of true penitence, the Priest must preach the Cross from the Cross. His whole life must be united to Christ, not only as the Priest and advocate, but to Him as the Victim and the Lamb slain. He must become a Man of God and bear in every part of his life the brand of the Cross, if he is to compel others by the spiritual power in him, to be separated from the world and bear the Cross. You must put, my sons, nothing less than this before you, if you want the "well-done" at last and the eternal reward.

There are a number of clergy in our day, who do not put this high standard before them or seek to conform their lives to the life of Christ crucified. There are those who go in, as they say, for what they can get, whose lives are governed by secondary motives, who are popular, successful, and will probably be well spoken of when they die, but who will wake up to find the Master saying, "You lived for yourself, not for me, and you have had your reward." They will say, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy Name, and in Thy Name done many wondrous works; built churches, presented large classes for confirmation, aided many charitable enterprises, preached the Gospel?" He will say, "I know you not," for it is true now, as it was in the days of St. Chrysostom and other fathers who declared that a large number of the clergy would certainly be lost, a larger proportion probably than of any other profession.

This is in itself very terrible to think of, but it applies to those who have no high aim concerning the Priesthood, no real purpose of self-consecration, who look away from the Cross and not to it, who do not realize to what Christ calls them and trust in His grace. For to aim high, to take the stricter line, to make sacrifice for Christ's service, is the way of safety. Christ's grace will never be wanting to those who have abandoned themselves to His protection. He loves men of great desires and aspirations as he did Daniel, and will provide all things necessary for their fulfillment. The only difficult and dangerous clerical line is that of half-hearted service and worldly conformity and prudential reserve. If our hearts are wholly with Him, His grace will be sufficient for us. His word "come" will sustain us in our venture on the water. The only thing you need fear, is the listening to some old and deceitful prophet, who bids you take a more comfortable and lower standard, or, if with generous devotion to our blessed Lord, you are determined to seek for nothing less than sanctity, dependence in any way upon yourself. The foundation of the saint is, distrust self. Grow in this distrust. Trust God. The sacraments are as full of grace now as when they made the heroes and the martyrs and the saints of old.

Another matter I wish to speak to you about is your life as seminarians. There is a danger, especially among men who have never been in any institution before, to look upon the seminary as if it were a

college. Now, the spirit of a theological seminary should be very different from that of a college, not only in its discipline, good order, devotion, its sobriety in manners, its edifying conversation, and in the spirit of piety which should pervade it, but in the relation of seminarians one to another. We stand in very different and in closer relations to one another than the members of a college. The relation between college students is a temporary one. They are independent one of another. Each has come with his own ulterior aim in life, each is to use or waste by his choice, the provided equipment for his future life. The collegian is not therefore bound to feel concerned in the success of his fellow-student, or in any way to exercise supervision of his conduct. The latter he would rather regard as a dishonorable thing. But it is very different in a seminary. We are united together by a divine call to be trained as officers in the army of Christ. We are to form, thus, one body. As the success of an army depends upon the fidelity of all its different members, so any unfaithfulness to Christ on the part of any one works an injury to all. We are bound therefore by every principle of honor, by the trust Christ reposes in us, by our allegiance to Him and His interest to guard the discipline, the spirit, the devotion, the spiritual life, of the seminary. As in the army, an officer would deem it disgraceful not to report neglect of duty of which he was cognizant on the march or in the field, so that same spirit of honor should animate you when any one is known, as the

Apostle says, to be walking disorderly. Let no mistaken sense of fellowship or good-nature or indifference blind you to your duty as an officer of the army, to your loyalty to Christ. By your own diligence and faithfulness, try to increase the spirit of devotion in your comrades, and with that high sense of honor which marks the military profession protest against everything in others which mars the effectiveness of the service. You are in training to be men of God. You are to be spiritual athletes. You are to be men of high moral character, men of firm resolve in matters of duty, men watchful over your own conduct, lest a world hateful of religion should be able in you to find any cause of offense. You are Christ-bearers. Christ trusts Himself to you by giving you the Blessed Sacrament; He trusts His Sacred Presence to your care. He relies on your honor to guard himself against insult. Guard His Presence in you. Like true Knights, determine to die, rather than do what is wrong. If thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut it off, for it is better for thee to enter life maimed than, having both hands and feet, to be cast into hell-fire.

There is a third matter about which I want to speak to you. You are my Candidates for Holy Orders. In admitting you to the Sacred Ministry, I take a grave responsibility. It is a responsibility which weighs upon my heart when I think of the number who have been unpreparedly admitted to Holy Orders. It is not because I do not trust you all, but because I love you, and earnestly desire you

may be most useful here and reach the highest rewards hereafter that I write this. When you came to me, I had not formulated the rules for my candidates, which I now must do. If any of you feel you cannot accept them, I will transfer you without blame, to any other Bishop you may choose. But we are living at a time when the Church's faith and practise is assaulted within and without, when men are denying the inspiration of Scripture, the reality of our Lord's Resurrection in the flesh, the vicarious character of His offering on Calvary, and the oil and wine of the Priesthood and the Sacraments. The Church needs trained men, devoted men, faithful men, who will live and die for her faith, men who are willing to cast their lives at the feet of Christ, men who will answer back the love of Christ who died for them by the responsive love which gives themselves and all they are to Him. Only by such a spirit can this Church of ours be saved. If you have anything of this spirit, I ask you to follow me. I ask no man to do what I am not willing to do myself. I ask no man to make sacrifices in which I do not lead and share. I believe with my whole heart this Church of ours can be saved and the dead bones as in Elijah's vision come together and be filled with life. And I believe an outpouring of the Holy Ghost throughout the whole Church of Christ has already begun, and that men and women are giving themselves up to a consecrated life with such enthusiastic devotion to the interests of Jesus as to recall the Pentecostal days. It is a blessed privilege to fight

for Jesus in such days as these. Fear nothing. Hope for everything. With God nothing is impossible. This is my motto and I pray it may be yours, "Jesus our All, and our all for Jesus."

Now, without asking you to consecrate your lives entirely to Christ's service as celibate priests, I do ask you to pray over it and ask God to give you the grace for the state of life which He Himself instituted, and to which He has given a special blessing. It is now as when "The ark, and Israel and Judah abide in tents; and the servants of my Lord are encamped in the open field"; (II. Sam. xi:11) and it is to a self-denying priesthood, and the offering of the Daily Sacrifice that the conquest of the world is given. While a celibate consecration is what I want you to think and pray about, there are some other minor matters of sacrifice which I must insist upon. If you wish to continue my candidates, during your candidateship I must ask you to promise to abstain from the use of all intoxicating beverages, save as used medicinally and under direction; to give up the use of tobacco, not to dance, play cards, nor to visit saloons or theaters. At the seminary I wish you to wear your cassocks at Church, in the refectory, and at recitations. I also request you, as it is more clerical, to remain shaven, if you do not wear full beards. Respecting these things I am only laying down rules for you while in training for the Priesthood.

If you will remember how the Disciples were trained by Christ for their work, how minute His

rules were (St. Matt. x,), and consider that your work is no different from theirs, viz. the advancement of a Kingdom upon which the eternity of souls depends, you will not deem these things either unwise or harsh. You will rejoice at every act of discipline which binds you closer to the Apostles and to the hero Saints of the Church. The Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. The good soldier of Jesus Christ must learn to endure hardness. If St. Paul found it necessary to beat his body with blows in order to bring it into subjection, we cannot afford to miss any discipline which may advance us in sanctity.

In this present time of distress, when the gates of hell are pressing against the Church, and she is calling for better-trained and more devoted warriors, let us not be cowards. As we realize how the heart agony of Christ is being prolonged and the Spirit's converting and convicting power hindered by the inefficiency of the Priesthood, let us try to mitigate that agony and further the Spirit's work, by casting ourselves and our little all of this present brief time on earth into the furnace fire of the Sacred Heart of our Blessed Lord.

With my love, prayers, and blessing,

YOUR FRIEND AND BISHOP.

THE CATHEDRAL, FOND DU LAC, WIS.,

January 7th, 1894

MY DEAR CANON:

I want if possible to work out our Cathedral system with the cordial coöperation of yourself and the other

clergy. Perhaps it is providential that questions arise thus early in order that we may together consider them and their solution, before any grave trouble arises. The mistake I think you are making lies in your taking your office of Senior Canon to be that of a Rector.

This is what you said to me — that you regarded it as such, and that leads to your feeling hurt at times, and hinders harmonious working. You look at everything from a Rector's point of view — a Rector's place, privileges, rights, precedences, etc.

Now in my idea of a Cathedral (it seems to me to be involved in the very idea of a Cathedral), there is no such office or officer as a Rector. A Rector is one who has the charge of a parish, but a Cathedral has no Rector. There is no such officer known nor can there be, because it is so absolutely antagonistic to the Cathedral system that it would destroy it. There is no one who can be Rector, neither Bishop, Dean, nor Canons. The powers, rights, privileges, and all that belongs to a Rector in a parish are divided up and shared in by all, Bishop, Dean, and Canons.

It takes them ALL TOGETHER to *make up* a *Rector*.

A Cathedral is a system where the officers have different departments of work, and are independent of each other in them — but in all those things in which they have common work to do, and have common duties, they must act together in common, and have their duties and places, etc., provided for by their common action in Chapter and by Statute or Rule.

The order of service, what services, the hours, the persons who are to be responsible for them, the celebrants and preachers, and the Ritual all come under this head.

You may ask me, what is the office of a Senior Canon and what "having the spiritual care" includes. I say first: No Canon is *a Rector* nor could a Dean be such — for it is destructive of the Cathedral system that there should be such an office — and none such is known.

A Canon is one who gives up the independent position and privileges of a Rector to take part in an organization, and take a department of what in a parish would be a Rector's work. "Spiritual care" marks for you your portion of a Rector's work. It includes the duty of visiting, care of Sunday School work in the Church, the Church guilds, the marrying, burying, visiting of the sick, the parish business, the Confirmation classes for those out of the schools.

As to Confessions, the rule of the Church allows her children to go to whom they choose, and any parishioner has a right to go to any priest of the Cathedral. This is the custom in all Cathedrals, and parishes where there are clergy houses, or more than one priest. All the clergy of the Cathedral should have their hours to see penitents in the clergy room or elsewhere.

This defines "the spiritual care."

The Privilege of a *Senior* would be that when the service was not arranged by Statute or Rule — or some matter came up not provided for, *the Senior*

is the one who decides for the occasion. I have thus put down what I think is the main difficulty, in fact the only one, and believe it comes from your confounding the position of a Canon with that of a Rector.

I don't want to have you troubled, and it pains me to see you so at times. I don't care who takes this or that service, and only want to help on, and if we can coöperate and work together in the establishment of a Cathedral system, I shall be very much pleased.

Yours sincerely in Christ,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Excerpts from Letters to a Layman

November 15, 1895

"I hope to make this a Catholic Diocese and am doing so very fast. Nearly all my Altars have lights on them and it is only the poverty of the clergy that keeps some of them from colored vestments and having crucifixes on the Altar. Pardon all this. Let us take heart. By God's grace we will make this Church Catholic in spite of Pastorals."

September 3, 1898

"I am very busy developing the Catholic work in my diocese. If God spares my life a few years, the Church will be surprised at what quietly has been established.

The Cathedral (186 feet long) is the most devotional building, with its four Altars and the Statues of the Saints, in the United States. It was empty and

destitute of all Church furniture save an Altar when I came. The great school building next to it of stone is two-thirds built and is in successful operation. It is a young ladies' school and we are sending out the heads of future families all over the State full of the Catholic Faith and Practice. I have a fine large confessional in the Cathedral and one Altar for the Masses for the dead. Some day you must come and see it."

Moscow, October 14, 1903

MY DEAR FRIEND:

I think you will be pleased to get a letter from this city and learn a little about our journey. When I arrived in England I was invited to Mr. Birkbeck's (pronounced Berbeck) country house at Stratton Strawlers, near Norwich. He is a country gentleman, being the Esquire of the place, and having a number of tenants on his property, and is the church warden, so it was a delightful Christian home in which was a chapel. Mr. B. says for the family morning prayer, the young people singing an antiphon to the Benedictus, Mr. B. playing on the organ, and I celebrated daily. Mr. B. gave a truly magnificent Cope and Mitre to the Bishop of Norwich to wear at the coronation. The Archbishop as you know ruled out Mitres. While there I preached before the local branch of the English Church Union and Mr. B. entertained the whole gathering on his grounds. But the chief delight there was that I secured Mr. B.'s company on my expedition. I had said to myself if I could do this, then surely God had sent me.

For he would be like the Angel that led out St. Peter till he came to the straight way that led to the City.

Mr. Birkbeck is an expert on all the Russian church questions. He has studied the people by traveling and living with them, speaks the language, and is a remarkably acute and able man and a trained theologian. You may have seen some of his writings. He is about forty-five. Moreover, he is well known to the English King and to the Russian Emperor. The latter gave him a place at his Coronation, and I think he must have been the only untitled person present. He knows, as we say, all the ins and outs of church politics in England and here, so it was everything for me to have him go with us and act as my pilot. From the moment we reached the Russian frontier every door has been opened to us. It was a small thing, but when we came to the first station, and custom house, everything was ready, a special room and an excellent repast well served, with officials bowing right and left. At St. Petersburg we took an apartment in the Hôtel d'Europe. There we were called on by the Exarch of Seogia, who was the principal Ecclesiastic in Petersburg, the Metropolitan Antonius being absent. He subsequently entertained us at the Lavra or Monastery. The celebrated Father John also came. The servants flocked about him in hall and passageway so that he had a struggle to get to his carriage, so anxious were they to touch him and get his blessing. We saw General Kireeff, who came often, being much

interested in our matter and having written about it; also Mr. Sabler, the Assistant Procurator of the Holy Synod did us much service. Then we went to the Monastery (near Moscow). The Troitsa (Holy Trinity), where the Metropolitan of Moscow had invited us. This is one of the most famous places in Russia. We were put up at the Guest House. The Metropolitan sent his carriage for me. We attended many services here. It was the feast day of their founder, St. Alexis. I was told there were about five or six thousand pilgrims in the place. It was quite a medieval sight when from a high terrace, some forty feet above them, the Metropolitan came with his priests and blessed the pilgrims, and the food prepared on long tables for them in the court below. Here I visited the Academy; there are four in Russia. These are for the best students preparing for orders. Also drove out to the Ecclesiastical Seminary and assisted the Metropolitan in giving the prizes away to the Students. At the Academy dinner, in a hall larger than that of the General Theological Seminary, there were some five hundred students and monks at table. The dinner at the Seminary was more select, prosperous, etc. Here toasts were given, and wine, and I made a speech. Vladimir the Metropolitan seems taken with me. He drove me back to the Troitsa in his own carriage, four horses and postilion. I was told this was the richest see in Russia and that his income is estimated at $150,000, about twice that of the Archbishop of Canterbury. He took us back to Moscow in his

private car. Here at Moscow we have the honor of being in the Monastery of St. Michael, in the Kremlin. No Anglican has ever been invited here. We have the grand suite of rooms belonging to the Metropolitan. You see he is ex-officio Abbot of this Monastery as well as of the Troitsa. He has his own residence elsewhere. I was present Sunday at the great church of St. Savior's. It holds twelve thousand or more, standing full. The Metropolitan celebrated. He gave me his throne in the space. Afterwards, when I went up to kiss the hand cross which he held, he did not let me kiss his hand, but saluted me with three kisses. This is the ordinary way of greeting a brother bishop. Afterwards we went to his palace, dined, and I would rather *tell* you than write of our mode of proceeding *in re* in regard to a better uniting of the churches. Mr. B. has been an invaluable guide. I have drawn up a letter or paper for Antonius (which B. has put in Russian), who is the *chief power* in the *Synod*, and whom B. knows and will see first. We go now to Petersburg to meet him. Much Love and all Blessings to you.

Ever gratefully, yours,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Bishop's House,
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, December 24, 1903

My dear Friend:

I was a few days in Chicago on church duty and found your telegram with its good news on my

return. What a strange Christmas for you and yours on the Pacific Coast. I keep thinking what you will do for services. It is a great comfort that the Holy Eucharist is the same everywhere. Perhaps the more humble the surroundings, if only reverent, the more like Bethlehem.

Have you ever thought how all creation was represented to do honor to the Nativity of Him by whom all things were made? Born at night, the stars were there visibly present, like candles on a Christmas tree, placed there by a loving Father. If for nothing else created, doing high service in giving dignity to their Maker's new entrance into His creation and one a torch bearer to the King of Kings. The Angels were present to announce this long-expected development, by which all things in heaven and earth were to be joined into one. Angels and men were there, of men both Jew and Gentile, Jewish shepherds and Gentile kings, of humanity both sexes, Mary and Joseph, and of all degrees, the high born and the lowly, the poor and the rich. The animal kingdom found its representative in the ox and the ass and the shepherd's flock, and earth's products in the gold, frankincense, and myrrh.

And there too about the Holy One, God Incarnate, are the veiled types of His three great offices as the Anointed Priest, Prophet, and King; this kingship is typified by the kings who come to do Him homage. His prophetical office by the shepherd's who guide and watch over their flocks. His priestly office by St. Joseph, who guards, by the offering of

himself, her who is the type of the church. The ass is the beast on which the King rides, the ox denotes the whole burnt offering which He is, the sheep tell also of Himself as the Lamb without spot and of the flock He guides.

The more we look into this divine and loving Mystery the more we see it is a birth that becomes a God. He whom the apostles testify had so supernatural an exit rising from the dead and visibly ascending had fittingly a like supernatural entrance. It was an entrance to which He himself bore witness when He declared His preëxistence "before Abraham was I am" and declared that He had "come down from heaven" and to which St. Joseph bore witness in that he was not his father. It was an event no more marvelous than many of the mysteries of nature and in accord with that progressive development of creation to which evolutionary science bears witness. To me its greatest proof is its meeting as nothing else does the needs of humanity, lightening its darkness, replacing speculations of the future with centuries, bringing forgiveness and reconstruction to man's nature, and opening a vista of usefulness here and progress hereafter that makes life worth living for.

And so I might, under the impulse of the great feast, go on. Pardon the sermon or sermonette. Remember me to all. Tell your dear son I pray that he may in kingly fashion serve this Lord and King in honorable service for the good of Him and in grateful worship to the giver back of his life.

With all Christmas blessings. Ever Yours in the Catholic faith and oneness in Christ.

Yours faithfully,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Fond du Lac, February 19, 1904

"Good gentle Bishop Tikhon has written me an affectionate letter asking me to make them all glad by coming on and being present at the consecration of the Archimandrite Raphael to the Episcopate, which will take place on Sunday the 14th March. Bishop Tikhon's Coadjutor Bishop Innocent will arrive the 8th March. He was my host as Prior of the Chudoff Monastery in the Kremlin. If nothing prevents, I shall come on, and am moved to do this more especially that I may enjoy seeing you."

Fond du Lac, 12th April, 1904

My dear Friend:

This is my birthday and I shall enter my seventy-fifth year. Solomon says wisdom is not always with gray hairs, and Mr. Lecky gave me matter for meditation as I lately read his statement that "the follies of age are perhaps more to be feared than the follies of youth!" "Often," he says; "while the faculties diminish, self-confidence increases. Obstinacy and prejudice strengthen while the reasoning force diminishes. The old lose the power of realizing new conditions, discoveries, etc." It is a rather trenchant arraignment. It leads me to say I shall vote for a change in the Church Constitution that makes

the oldest bishop our Primus, and quote Solomon and Lecky for my contention.

I have been made happy to-day by a telegram just received saying that on the first ballot and almost unanimously Dr. F. was chosen to be the Coadjutor of the Bishop of Springfield. He is a thorough Catholic and will be a great gain to us in the House of Bishops. I was greatly interested in this election for it makes our proposed Province of these Central Western Dioceses solidly Catholic. I do not doubt but that he will accept.

Then to-day, the Sisterhood of the Holy Nativity, I founded, has voted to build its Mother House out here in Fond du Lac. It is a community founded twenty-two years ago, not for taking charge of schools or institutes, but for aiding the parochial clergy to do their mission and parish work. To prepare candidates for baptism, confirmation, confession, to keep up intercessory prayer, to forward the Catholic Faith. It will strengthen the community very much at last to have its own convent, and greatly aid the work of this Diocese and the West.

FOND DU LAC, Easter Even, 1904

"This will bring you my Easter greeting. May it be freighted with health to body and peace of soul.

My Warden brought back word that you were in the Doctor's hands. I fear I have been setting a bad example in this respect. But with rest and careful diet I am at my daily work again. So soon as my last Tract gets out of the printer's hands, I will send

you some copies. The subject is 'Absolution in God's Word.' The clergy I hope will profit by it, for I shall send a large number 'with the author's regards.' Our clergy need to be taught and to be taught how to teach.

You will be glad to know the Diocese is steadily making progress. There is little doubt but that we shall go up to the General Convention with a record roll call of fifty clergy or over. A good advance from the eighteen I found here on coming. Our opponents may say what they will, the Catholic faith appeals to people, especially to the men."

PROVIDENCE, Saturday, July 10, 1904

"Yesterday the Rev. F. Van Allen of the Church of the Advent came hither to see me and we had a long conference about arrangements at the General Convention.

The Catholic clergy have asked a number of others to join them in having frequent or daily celebrations at the Advent and I will try if at other places every Sunday there will be a solemn celebration. At the Advent a different Mass will be sung on the Sundays, giving examples of the different styles of Church music, Gregorian, Anglican, and Modern like the St. Cecilia.

We are going to have a large number of Church Tracts placed in the Churches for free distribution.

On Sunday afternoons at four, at the Advent, there will be a special conference, just a hymn and collects and then one or more addresses on some im-

portant or burning Church topic. On the first Sunday afternoon Bishop Doane has agreed to preside and speak on the marriage and divorce question. He is sound on that. On the next Sunday Bishop Potter has agreed to speak on *Social and Industrial Problems.* We have not settled for the third. Perhaps I may be asked to take the chair and speak on the *Religious Organizations and their Work and Usefulness.*"

FOND DU LAC, January 24, 1905

"I have received the beautiful framed picture of St. Edward's choir and sanctuary. Its symbolism and color arrangement continue to grow on one. It is all so perfect and so hallowed.

How few persons realize that our Anglican division of the chancel into choir and sanctuary bears witness to the double mode of ordained worship by act and word which goes back to Eden. By act I mean sacrifice as found there in the two trees, and by word Adam's communion with God. So the two forms were preserved in the synagogue and temple service. So in the Christian we have as their continuation the divine office and the Altar sacrifice.

In the sectarian meeting houses we find the synagogue service, but no Altar for sacrifice. In the Roman, the Altar, but for the people very little of the Divine Office.

St. Edward's, by her marked coloring and decorations, brings out the distinction between the two and their combination."

As to "Christian and Catholic"

Hotel Netherland, New York,
Monday Noon, February 27, 1905

My dear Friend:

My stay with you has been a delightful one and I go on my journey with a glad heart. Thanks for all your loving kindnesses.

Order has been given Longmans to send the fifty copies to the Rector of St. Edward's.

The backbone of the first part is the *Resurrection of Christ* which is the great credential. And if one had so unique an exit, he must have had as unique an entrance into this world. This helps men to become Christians.

The backbone of the second part is the chapter on Sacrifice. Sacrifice is a reciprocal action between God and man. Man's gift to God and God's returning gift to man. This complete view of Sacrifice makes it an essential of all religion. There is no complete presentation of religion without it.

Being so, it follows, that a priesthood to offer the sacrifice is a necessity of the true religion. This demolishes the sectarians.

This is the reason why I put sacrifice first and then followed it with the chapter on the ministry.

The backbone of the third part is found in the chapters on the Papal claim — St. Peter at Rome. Conclusion, "Stay where you are."

I can but believe the book is going to be an instructor of our people and clergy in the Catholic

faith. But it is likely to be fired into by the theological trailers of the polemic sea.

With all good wishes and blessing,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Fond du Lac, April 4, 1905

"Nearly all the Bishops sent letters of acknowledgment. Bishop Gailor said: 'I have read it with care and find it strong, able, and helpful. I congratulate you upon being permitted to make this distinctly valuable contribution to the literature of the Church.' Bishop of Los Angeles: 'I have had a hard struggle with myself to lay it by. It is charming as a book and as easy to read as a novel.' Bishop of Duluth wrote: 'I have been strongly impressed by the grace, breadth, and charity of the writer and the strength and wisdom of his counsels. I want to thank you for that comparison of Henry VIII. to Pontius Pilate. It is both felicitous and accurate.'

Bishop Potter wrote: 'Your book has great value in its conception, etc., the purpose and plan of it is designed to be helpful to perplexed minds, and in its temper it is a lesson to all of us! In a great many cases it will be found, I venture to think, a most helpful manual for priests who want to put into their people's hands something which stands for a reverent, scholarly, and candid faith to-day. I congratulate you on being able to give to beclouded minds so helpful a volume!'

Bishop Scarborough: 'The name of your book

is well chosen, for it is both. While your statements of the Church's position is clear, strong, its spirit is admirable. The preface is the key to all that follows. Your chapters on the ministry and Anglican orders seem to me unanswerable and convincing. Indeed the entire book is bound to give those who read it a fair view and clear understanding of the position and teaching of our Church. I congratulate you on the spirit of broad charity, which is a most pleasing feature of the whole volume. It will do great good by correcting wrong impressions as well as by teaching plain truths, etc.'

I have secured kind notes of acknowledgment from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. I enclose a review from the *Boston Transcript*. There was also a most favorable one written by F. van Allen in the *Churchman*.

A slight criticism was made on my saying that in the Anglican Church it was by laying on of the Bishop's *hand*. It was not a mistake. The English book always has had the singular form. There was an interesting explanation given by experts on the use of the plural, hands, in the American book which has been thought to be originally a printer's error.

Dr. Fulton, in the *Church Standard* in an otherwise very favorable notice, thought there was a contradiction between two statements. In one I said our Lord was a priest after the order of Melchizedek (Heb. v. 6). In another that if on earth He should not be a priest, see Heb. viii. 4. In

this I was simply following Holy Scripture and gave the explanation of the seeming contradiction.

The professors of the Cambridge, Philadelphia, Sewanee, Nashotah, and Alexandria seminaries have received the book, and the Dean of the latter has expressed the hope that I might visit that school of the prophets, another small sign from the South."

FOND DU LAC, May 10, 1905

MY DEAR FRIEND:

The enclosed cutting is from the *Scottish Chronicle*, a sectarian paper, published in Scotland. The reviewer does not like his medicine.

"In the Bishop's treatment of the Gospel history we could willingly have spared the introduction of the notion of the cattle 'kneeling' in the stable at Bethlehem; as also the over-bold speculation involved in the following passage relating to the boyhood of our Blessed Lord; 'He obeys S. Joseph in the carpenter's shop, though assured that the directions he gives are far from the most scientific and correct.' Why should the carpentering of S. Joseph be thus made light of? We suppose it is to give expression to the Bishop's rejection of recent kenotic theories as to the knowledge of our Lord in His state of humiliation. But the documents of the Gospel present a history which is not improved by the colouring of fancy.

"The opening words of Bishop Grafton's work are: 'This book is not controversial.' But this is true only in the sense in which the attitude of Mrs. Squeers was not controversial towards the young gentlemen in the establishment of Dotheboys Hall. If they would patiently open their mouths and swallow her treacle and brimstone, there was no controversy between her and them. We have seldom read a more audacious statement than that the book 'Christian and Catholic' is 'not controversial.'"

FOND DU LAC, July 18, 1905

"I hear of the result of the book in various directions. A Roman Catholic Priest, of clean life and obvious ability, has put himself in correspondence with me, and desires to enter my Diocese. He wants, as he says, to be a Catholic but not a Roman. I believe there are many such, and if our Church was only what St. Edward's is, or our Cathedral here, we should have more applications than we should know what to do with.

Bishop Potter and some others are really awakened to the Polish Catholic movement in this country. For several years I addressed the House of Bishops on the subject and gained but little hearing. Now they want me, with some others, to see what can be done in the way of establishing intercommunion.

. . . . . .

I cannot begin to tell you of the enthusiasm and love and unity manifested amongst the clergy in my diocese. The influence of it is extending in various directions. I cannot be too thankful to God for the love of my clergy and their coöperation."

FOND DU LAC, September 23, 1905

"On the 8th September I dedicated the new convent here. It was an epoch. The building is strictly conventual. It cost about $60,000 and is paid for. The Chapel is very devotional and was the gift of Miss C., of Boston, in memory of her mother. We had thirty-two Sisters and Postulants in line."

FOND DU LAC, November 4, 1905

"I have been very busy this last week in the endeavor to stop Bishop Tikhon from ordaining Dr. Irvine to the priesthood on Sunday the 5th November. He is a good, gentle, pious Christian Bishop who has been imposed upon. For the sake of the Russian Church I am sorry it should take up with a man who rightly or wrongly has been deposed from the priesthood. There was no necessity for it, for Dr. Irvine could have appealed to the Court of Review lately established, or to the House of Bishops sitting, as they do, in Council. The action of Archbishop Tikhon can only be based on the view that we are no part of the Catholic Church and so all relations between us must terminate, or on the ground that he has received authority from the Holy Synod to receive appeals from our courts. In the latter case I said that we had received no notice of such authority being delegated, and if we had, and had accepted it according to the Canon of the Universal Church which he was bound to respect, he could only hear appeals from bishops and not from priests who were confined to appeals within their own nationality or province.

My telegrams will be published in next week's *Living Church;* our presiding Bishop has protested. The Archbishop has made a big, bad blunder.

I asked the Russian Ambassador to interfere with his influence. But I fear Tikhon will steer his craft on the rocks. My hope is that God will in some way overrule this to good, for it is Satan's work."

FOND DU LAC, January 16, 1906

"On the 21st–24th of January there is to be a meeting of the Bishops of the fifth department of *our Province*. I send you the list or plan of the Divisions we got at the last General Convention. The meeting takes place at Indianapolis. I want to urge the Bishops, about twelve, to take the first steps in organizing themselves properly into a Province.

The ancient Provincial system was in ancient times a great bulwark against the centralized power of the Papacy. We have a syndicate Papacy in our Church at New York, and the only proper and Catholic protection against its increasing power is our organization into Provinces.

The Provincial system will also be a means of increasing the Missionary Spirit by its yearly meetings, but give a stimulus to the Church system of Education, etc."

FOND DU LAC, February 1, 1906

"In the slip from the *Sun* it is stated that Archbishop Tikhon 'does *not* believe in the validity of Anglican Orders.' He does. The context shows this. But some one slipped in the word 'not.'

I think it possible that good may come out of the Irvine case and lead the Russian Synod to acknowledge our orders. The Emperor has granted the church the privilege of holding a Council. It will meet sometime this year. I think the ancient Patriarchate of Moscow will be revived."

FOND DU LAC, July 26, 1906

"How little our people realize the gospel value of giving. It is with prayer and fasting one of the three great virtues commanded by our Lord. In the Book of Ecclesiastes, which we read for instruction, it is stated that as water quencheth fire, alms resisteth sins. I suppose it means by the grace with which God responds to it. And our Lord says, 'Give alms and all things are clean unto you.' They sanctify our actions and our enjoyments."

BALTIMORE, MD., October 16, 1907

"Those of our party gave me warm congratulations on the effect of my action in respect to the assault of the Bishop of —— on the continued reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. I feared so strong was his denunciation of the practices of benediction and processions, that the House would be carried off its feet and make what he desired them to do, a formal and official declaration of doctrine. I moved and carried a reference of the whole matter to a Committee. The Bishop had based his argument upon a statement that the declaration of the Bishops in 1895 in their Pastoral letter had been misconstrued and misused. It had only allowed reservation for the sick in cases of emergency with permission of the Ordinary. This, it had been claimed, allowed of continuous reservation. Of course, if the parish priest was to be prepared for cases of emergency, the Sacrament had to be reserved continuously. But I very boldly put myself on the

ground that the rubric in the prayer book did not prohibit reservation in the American Church, as the American rubric had been altered from that in the English. I do not think this argument took with the majority of the House of Bishops, to whom it was all novel, and they are not accustomed to a legal investigation of rubrics and canons; but my appeal to them for union amongst ourselves and preserving the peace of the Church did tell quite effectively; and the Committee reported that it was not advisable to make any formal declaration, but that the statement in the Pastoral of 1895 was not ambiguous and did not allow of any other interpretation which had been put upon it, etc. The report was simply received without vote, as a matter of course, and that was the end of it, no vote being taken. The Committee was discharged. Bishop —— in our House and Dr. —— of the other, are the two great opponents of the Catholic faith, however much in several accounts they may differ. My delegation which I took there did nobly."

PALM BEACH, FLA., February 17, 1910

"Your reference to Canon —— in your last letter made me think over the conversation lately had with him on the growth of our diocese and the sources of its external influence. As you had so much to do with them, I think you might like to have them stated in logical order.

First, there is the remarkable growth in the diocese, in some thirty or forty new churches or rectories,

in the development of the Young Ladies' Academy, Grafton Hall, in the value of the church property, which has increased from $250,000 to $700,000.

Secondly, there has been a remarkable increase of working clergy and communicants. The communicants have increased from twenty-five hundred to over five thousand; the latter number under our new Canon representing only actual communicants, all those who have made their communions within a year. The clergy have increased from eighteen to now fifty. There are also a large number of twenty-six candidates for holy orders. I suppose this is a larger number than is to be found in any diocese except New York. I was enabled to obtain a legacy for Nashotah House of $350,000, which, together with $60,000 which they before had, puts the institution on a good financial basis and supplies the means for the support of those candidates which we have there.

Again, as you know, we have raised the endowment for the support of the episcopate from $9000, which was all we had at the commencement of my office, to now $70,000. Thanks to God and your good help! The Cathedral, which was some $16,000 in debt when I came, has had that removed, and though we are $2600 in debt for repairs, we have an endowment of $14,000. The cathedral congregation, though, is a poor one and finds it difficult to raise the $4500 needed for its annual support.

The Sisterhood of the Holy Nativity has its motherhouse at Fond du Lac; the convent is an

admirable one; it cost about $60,000 or $70,000, and is paid for. The sisterhood has six houses altogether; a branch among the Oneida Indians here in Fond du Lac diocese, a house at Milwaukee in connection with the cathedral there, and in the East, houses at Portland, Me., Providence, and one in connection with St. Mary's Church, New York.

We cannot speak too highly of Grafton Hall! It has developed remarkably under the supervision of Canon ——. He is my alter ego; during his twenty years some hundreds of alumnae have been sent forth. They have turned out to be educated, refined, Christian churchwomen, and their influence is to be found throughout the West.

Then our church literature has been a source of external influence. My Tract No. 1 upon 'The Church in the New Testament' reached a circulation of over forty thousand; my other works, *Christian and Catholic*, *Catholic Atlas* and the *Autobiography* just out, are doing good service, here and in England.

It was under my assistance and counsel that the Fond du Lac Church Furnishing Company was established. It began in the smallest way; there are now one hundred men on payroll; we are sending church furniture to all parts of the country. In my own diocese there is always a tabernacle on the altar and we introduce them wherever we can. We are building the Catholic faith into the minds and imagination of the people.

Again, the Provincial system has been inaugurated

and the twelve bishops of the fifth department are, with perhaps one exception, working in harmony. R—— has the hope that some one might be led to endow a Ladies' Church college here in the West; he would be a grand man to head such a work. In the East there are a number of such colleges, but we have none in the West. We should have the support of all the Bishops of our province and of the schools in them.

Then too, as Superior General of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, we are associated with three hundred and fifty clerical members, who more or less look to us for guidance.

I have not stated this in any way of praise, for the work has been of God and through the aid of a body of able coworkers. There are some things I would like to see accomplished before the time of my passing comes, but I am already more than thankful for what the good God has let me do and for the loving and generous support you have given me. We are working together for a great cause, the catholicization of our American Church, unseen in many places; the work is growing and there are more signs of hopefulness than we appreciate. With my sincere love and all bright blessings."

FOND DU LAC, November 22, 1910

MY VERY DEAR FRIEND:

I know that you are so much interested in all my doings, and follow me with such loving prayers, that I write to tell you what the doctor says of me. You

know I have been troubled for many months with this pain in my right knee and leg, and nothing seems to relieve it. Dr. Wiley gave me an examination yesterday, and gave this disorder some technical name. He says nothing will relieve it except absolute rest, and has put me in bed for a couple of weeks, so I shall keep my Thanksgiving Day in bed, but hope to be up before Christmas surely.

It has been a spiritual benefit to me to think how our dear Lord fell in carrying His Cross to Calvary, and so bruised His knees, and I may humbly hope that this dispensation of His providence may be like a little stigmata of the Passion. I am all unworthy to be united to Him in any way, but it may thus be for my own sanctification and the good of the Church.

I am trying to arrange a meeting between our Committee and the Polish Old Catholic Bishop, and also with the Syrian Bishop Raphael. I am glad I can help somewhat by direction and prayer.

You must take care of yourself, my very dearest friend, for God has given us a work to do together for His church.

With my loving regards and blessing.

FOND DU LAC, February 21, 1911

" As to Dr. M——'s article. I have written to the 'Young Churchman Company' about it, and asked the editor to see that it was properly replied to. As several correspondents had taken up the matter, I did not care to write, but I may do so by and by.

Dr. M—— quibbles. His two errors are these. He thinks the Caroline Divines do not hold the same belief as we do, because they do not use the same language. For example, they unquestionably hold the doctrine of the Real Presence, as occasioned by the Consecration, but do not use the words objective, and subjective, because they are modern philosophical terms. They hold the doctrine of confession with priestly absolution, but don't call it sacramental confession, which is a mere matter of terminology. They believe in the Real Presence, but denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, as then understood, which involved the destruction of the elements as a necessary condition of our Lord's true body and blood. They regarded the holy Eucharist as a sacrifice, but denied, as we do, that it was a repetition of Calvary, or added anything to its redemptive action. They taught the Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, but would carefully discriminate this from adoration of the elements.

I do not think that Dr. M—— will succeed in stirring up strife, for the tendency now is for Churchmen of all schools to draw together."

FOND DU LAC, March 8, 1911

"I look to Nashotah along with some of the other Seminaries as the hope of the coming Catholicity of the Church. The talk that candidates for Orders are scarce, I do not agree with. There is no scarcity of candidates where the Catholic Faith is presented to them. We have sixty-six at Nashotah, part of

whom are in the Preparatory Department. We intend to develop this from a two years' course to a three, and so give an excellent collegiate training to the young men."

Sermon on the Rich, in a Letter to a Layman

Bishop's House,
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, June 21, 1912

My dearly beloved Friend:

I often turn in mind to our many serious conversations. They were days of much peace and joy, with the honor of Christ's presence. We must not let the influence of those days die out, and I take the loving liberty of my office and friendship to send you a word of Gospel cheer.

First, God has, in His providence, entrusted you with large means. It has been with you a matter of most serious consideration. You have endeavored most lovingly, wisely, devotedly, to expend much for the dear Master's sake. Like Cornelius your alms and prayers have come up for a memorial before God. And His loving protection has been round about you and He blessed you in "your basket and in your store." A wealthy person said to me, "You never fail to hear the duties of riches inculcated in the summer season. The parable of Dives and Lazarus always gave the straggling clergyman a fine opportunity to score the dangerous position of the wealthy." I remarked that possibly he had not considered the fact that there were *two* very rich men

stated in the parable. There was of course Dives, with his sad ending, through neglectful use of money; but most commentators overlook the fact that there was another rich man in the story; he was not only rich, but very rich, he was no less a person than Abraham himself, in whose great, loving-hearted bosom, the faithful were to rest.

If we have wealth our first duty is to thank God for it, and to pray we may use it wisely.

Second, To break it, like our box of Alabaster over the Blessed feet, in the Holy Eucharist. My great love for you sprang not from your loving donations but from the love which prompted them. We have been loving coworkers in the Catholic cause.

Our life does not free us from care and responsibility, as many think. It imposes duties, but it brings great blessings. We are so much more our own masters, masters of our time and opportunities of worship, masters of the opportunities of doing good, and the rich man has his secret with his own dear Lord. Our Lord indeed says, "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God." An interpretation which has found favor with me has been that, in Jerusalem, beside the larger city gate, there was a smaller one for foot passengers and single travelers, called the "eye of a needle." It would be with difficulty that the heavily laden camel could pass through that smaller aperture. It would be necessary for his owner to relieve him of some of his burden, in order that he might pass. It is this

act of sacrifice that is pointed out by our Lord's parables, riches as demanding sacrifice, as a means of sanctification. And the joy of giving to our Lord is a secret between the soul and Himself, which has its own deep hidden sense of joy.

The instances in Holy Scripture of wealthy, yet holy men, reveal the great truth that wealth does not hinder us from walking with God. The pious soul holds it as a gift from Him. It is only a foretaste of the greater riches that are to come. The pious soul trusts Him for all, uses all for His sake, has His interests first at heart. God loves His children to be happy and enjoy the wealth He gives. He enjoys it with them, He blesses it to their good and happiness. He would make all beautiful as representative of Himself. God is often represented to us as the Ancient of Days. He is also to be known as eternal youth. All the eternal freshness that perpetual youth implies, is His, and His gift of eternal blessedness can never be exhausted, because He is ever young. We have a right thus to be optimists and walk in the bright, glad sunshine of His protecting Love.

God is a wealthy God. All things are His. He distributes His wealth most bountifully. The rich man is a particular participant. There are three great acts of our good God which I love to dwell on. 1. His wonderful and all glorious act of creation. He spake the word and Creation arose in all its beauty before Him. 2. Next, He became incarnate, He entered creation heralded by choirs of

angels, the word was made flesh. Heaven and earth rang with the blessed anthem, we fall prostrate before His magnificent Advent. 3. His third great act in logical sequence is His further entry into creation and man. He said, "This is My body and this is My blood" — wonderful and all glorious trinal mystery. It completes the mighty sequence of His action. We may reverently believe that the blessed mystery of the Eucharist lives on in some divine splendor in the divine life.

What a blessed privilege it is to be able to found a daily Eucharist; it is a privilege which angels may aspire to, but cannot enjoy. I hope some day that our Cathedral with its daily Mass may be put upon a permanent foundation.

With what tender familiarity and comforting support is our dear Jesus with us in this sacrament. He gathers us up into His own heart of love, He reveals the secrets of His providences to us, He is our Saviour, our Jesus, our All in all, the bright joy of our hope, the door through which we pass into the Father's Love.

In my illness and pain I have been moved thus to write you, dearest friend. May our Lord join us together in His Love and work.

With my most affectionate greetings,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Fond du Lac, March 12, 1909

"I send you a copy of the letter which my good Indians wrote me, of their own accord, and without

external aid. It is far from true that the only good Indian is a dead one. Give them the Catholic Faith, and they become good Christians. The whole Reservation is changed since I have been there. We have an improved Mission House, a fine barn connected with it, a Sisters' house with three Sisters at work, and a splendid stone Guild house for School work, entertainments, lectures, etc., also an excellent band, a small hospital with an Indian doctor, whom we educated, a creamery to teach the men farming, and a large stone church. It is all paid for. We have regular congregations of from four to five hundred. The Romans have been pushing in, and are trying to get the Government School buildings. It is said that the Government is going to give up the schools, wherein now we have much influence through the coöperation of the Government agent. The Romans either want to buy them, or get them given to them by the Government, if they are abandoned. It is said they have influence at Washington, and have been promised political aid.

"'To the Rt. Rev. Father in God, C. C. Grafton:

We, the members of the Oneida Church,[1] desire to acknowledge in a few words the great and wonderful lesson which the good God has inspired you to teach us; we also desire to thank you and Him most sincerely for undertaking this great goodness towards us, your loving people of Oneida. We know that it is the great love you feel towards us that led you to write this wonderful letter to us; the words I am sure were most gratefully received, they were words most needed by your people here, words so lasting and full of meaning to us.

[1] See page 322.

It seems impossible for us to find words to express the warm feeling in our hearts for the great goodness you have done for us, and we earnestly hope that we will all take heed the great and good lesson you have so kindly set before us. We remain ever your children in the Lord.

J. Q. Adams, *Senior Warden*
Simeon Hill, *Junior Warden*
Brigman Cornelius, *Clerk*
Nicholas Elm
Thomas Cornelius
Sampson J. Cornelius
Henry F. Smith.'"

To One in Great Sorrow

Bishop's House,
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, April 9, 1900

My dear Daughter in Christ:

Your double loss is indeed a grievous one. But it is not because God in any way desires to afflict you. He grieves with your grief and for you, and if it were better for the dear ones who have passed, and for His wise purposes, would not so afflict you or any of us. I love to think He never desires to give pain, but allows it for some good purpose. Our parents and friends and relatives pass from us into His merciful care. While we grieve, those on the other side welcome them with joy. We say, she is gone; they say, she is come. We say she is dead; they say, another child is born. As about our cradles love prepares a welcome, so when thither we appear, our needs, are they not provided for by the welcome of those we love? If we think of them, we shall not wish aught different for their sakes. If

aught should grieve them in reference to ourselves, it is unwillingness to yield up our loved ones to His keeping. By our conformity to His will we send a flash of Joy to their hearts. For do they not rejoice in Him at every submission we make and at every act of our faith? And can we not make this known to Him by means of the Blessed Sacrament? For Him whom we receive is the Living Bond beween us and them. So every act of loving submission and acceptance of His dear will, and bright, brave, loving acts of union with us, pass through Him to them, and His heart is the medium of communication. So we flash to them, by our faith and love, the signal that all is well with us and they rejoice in our acceptance of the Blessed will; we gladden them by our loving resignation, and He, making it known to them, wipes all tears from their eyes. May our dear Lord be thus to you a comfort as He becomes your message Bearer to those you love. So will death rather unite than separate us from those within the veil.

With my blessing, your father in Christ,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Letters to an Aspirant

January 11, 1905

My dear Daughter in Christ:

God has led you to a special degree of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, and to do a work for him among the poor, the children, and in hospitals. It is the kind of work our sisters do.

The question is — whether He is not calling you

to a further union with Himself in the Religious life. That life is a special union with our Lord, wrought out by the keeping of the three counsels, and cannot be attained outside of a community. God has tested your faithfulness by these years of devotion and now has so freed you from home duties that you could enter on such a life.

The fact that you are deeply interested in your children, and hospital work, and are doing good, is no sign that you are not called to leave it for a season. God, when He calls persons to religion, does not pick out idlers. He calls from duties to other duties. He calls on us to make ventures of faith and to leave our work in His hands. He calls us to leave all and follow Him. Not to have the trust in Him, comes from self, and we may be as selfish in spiritual things as in others.

I could not but smile when you wrote about your having your window open and thought you might not have that privilege in a community. One of our sisters does.

But in a community, the care of others and the blessing that comes from self-abnegation and obedience, brings a greater blessing than having our own, though spiritual, ways. But this is a diversion.

The question you must consider is, whether the past providences of God, in freeing you from home duties, are not a sign together with your devotion that you may have a vocation to the Religious life. It is the highest honor our Lord can bestow on any one for it means such a consecrated and mysterious

union with Him as shall last throughout eternity. You have now what any person not so consecrated may have, and there God may leave you. But He may be calling you to more. One other sign is this: It has all been so easy up to now. This would require the giving up of what to you would be the hardest, and require the most self-sacrifice, would call for at your age, for the greatest discipline, that of obedience. The call to be under persons as our Lord Himself was, when He went down to Nazareth.

I do not know whether God is calling you to that more intimate and lasting union.

But I do know this, that if He has any design for the extension of the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament in our Church it can only be carried out by and in a Religious community.

Concerning Religious communities, I do not believe that you or any person should try and form one, without having had some years of training in one. The result could only injure the cause it was desired to promote.

If you are called to do something for the Church in the way we have spoken of, it is through some Religious Order; and where one exists which has an especial devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, is it not rather rash to start another?

Do not misunderstand me. I have no wish to dictate. God in His love has led you to where you are. He may, I cannot say more, call you to the further privileged union. All I want is to help you to be so detached as to be ready to respond if He

calls. If he calls you, make a venture of faith and come to Him on the waters. He has done so much for you. I want you, if it is His will, to do all you can for Him. By giving oneself to the Religious life, a woman can do more for Christ in our day and in our Church, than in any other way or by any other work. A Religious by the mere fact of being a Religious, bears a greater witness for Christ to the Catholic Church, than all the works of all the Philanthropists put together.

And so I leave the matter to Him. When He calls you, be ready to say, Here am I.

With my prayers and Blessing,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

January 16, 1905

My dear Daughter:

Thank you for so letting me see your heart and Our Lord's dealings with you.

I have no doubt that it has been His work with you and that He has called and protected you in a special life of devotion to Himself.

Saints are joined both in the technically religious life and out of it, and persons are called to union with our Lord in different ways. I do not doubt but you may be as closely united to our Lord as any Religious may be.

But then, a Religious lives her union and her special union with our Lord which is wrought out by keeping the three counsels, and that of obedience cannot be practised in the same way out of a Religious Community as in it.

I do not say, one may not be as closely united with our Lord, or be as truly a saint indeed, or have as many hardships, or practise obedience in other ways — all this is true, only souls are called by different ways to a union with Him, and that in Religion is one way and that out of it is another.

In your own case, it seems to you that He has called you out of it, and not called you in that way. I, believing that it is safe for you to follow His guiding, have nothing further on that point to say. Go as you believe God leads you.

But if our Lord does design to develop the worship to the Blessed Sacrament, by allowing this Church of ours to have perpetual adoration, it is evident that it can only be done by a Community. It is this I feel I am called to and am working for in the Holy Nativity.

I could not advise you or any one to start a Sisterhood without going through a long novitiate in some Sisterhood. A holy priest is going to begin a Benedictine house in my diocese. I have known and loved him for over twenty years. He has been with me when I was a Cowley father. But neither does he nor I think it well to begin, until he has gone over to England and passed his novitiate there. It is a great loss to me, but I give him up thus to God. So I should say to any drawn to devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, if called, to forward the movement in our Church other than by one's own personal life, and devotion, by all means do it through a community. Of course you feel also the

work for souls, and this should be connected with it. If there is no such community, go into one and get trained — start one. If there is one, seek to carry out God's calling through it. But unless one is distinctly called to do this, go on as you are; you are His and He is yours.

With all my Blessings on all you do for Him,

Yours in Christ,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

P.S. I think I made it clear that a Sisterhood could consider a proposition to take aspirants from a parish with the agreement to establish a branch house in it.

October 27th, 1906

My dear Daughter:

There was never a greater need for united prayer among Catholics than now.

The Church and the State in Europe are not only dividing but are being opposed to each other. We are reverting to the times before Constantine and persecution.

The State in Europe, in Italy, France, England, is fighting the Church of Christ.

The world-spirit disbelieves in and hates Catholicity. It is full of cynical unbelief and hatred. Satan has raised up a number of false religions, especially in our country, and helped them with supernatural gifts. Mormonism, Spiritualism, Doweism, Eddyism, are some of these. There is an uncatholic and human spirit of Philanthropy

most subtle, of Socialism, etc., and of so-called (and it probably is) Reform, all of which is not based on Christ, but on human progress. Its leaders are great men and seemingly good, temperate, pure, etc., full of schemes for the people's advancement.

But they are false and counterfeit Christs. Signs of the latter age. We are living in a time and country wherein Satan and his fallen angels are having a tremendous power. It is their day and time. I call it "the age of Satan." America or the United States is the field of the great final conflict.

But the Church cannot be crushed out of existence. The "Two Witnesses" of the Word and the Sacraments will rise and stand on their feet again. They are doing it now. Hidden from the world there will be a great spiritual movement, and souls will be drawn to Christ, and saints will be made, and the predestinated number of the elect will be made up, and then Christ will come. He will destroy the Kingdom of this world, and the wickedness of man will cease.

Every prayer helps on the grand consummation. Pray for the Religious life in our church. Upon it its salvation, I think, depends.

All things are in turmoil. The Church needs to be aroused. The prayers of the faithful can save it.

With all Blessings to you and the little Band,

Yours, in Jesus and for Jesus and His Kingdom,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

P.S. I will send you my tract on the Real Presence, and give a copy to each of the members.

FOND DU LAC, WISCONSIN, April 24th, 1911

MY DEAR:

Thank you for your breath of sweetness from the woods. They are quite a type, in contrast to garden flowers, of the hidden saints of God. The human eyes overlook the vast numbers of earth's little floral offerings to God, but the dear Blessed God, Who made man, sees them, and knows each one, even as He knows each little simple-minded infant-like child of God.

I love to think I am tucked away in some little corner of His great Heart, and He hears my breathing, and knows my desires to be of holiness, and in union with Himself.

May God bless you, my daughter, in your sweet rest on Him.

Pray for me, that entering into the twenty-third year of my Episcopate, I may be a more effective instrument for the building up of His Kingdom.

With my love and Christian benediction,

Yours sincerely,

C. C. FOND DU LAC.

Monday Evening, December 7

MY DEAR DAUGHTER:

We have had a delightful day so far as the weather is concerned, while near by at Racine and a little farther on at Chicago there has been a heavy fall of snow. We got no storm, while up and down the Eastern coast we read of them. I think Fond du Lac must in some way be sheltered. Let us hope

it lies out of the storm tracks — political, financial, and ecclesiastical as well.

Every now and then the Milwaukee papers try to stir up some confusion, but fail to produce any effect by their sensational head lines. In this respect the western papers are worse than those in the east. Church matters should be kept out of the secular press. A great deal of harm is done to religion by the covert attacks made by the newspapers, under the mask of news.

I gave a long address to the Nashotah students on Catechising, on my last visit, and hope here at the Cathedral to establish with fuller details the system I began at the Advent years ago and which was a sort of contraction of the French and English methods in Sunday School work. The children are such an important factor in Church work. Never have I felt it so much as now, and the other day when thinking over the matter I saw, as never before, the fuller meaning of our Lord's actions in respect of the children. His ministration to children follows the sacramental line, of provision and care. I can only write a little of what is in my mind. But He bids them come to Him and blames those who would have kept them from Him. Our Church has put her sanction on His act of taking them up in His arms and blessing them as Symbols of Holy Baptism. Perhaps it sets forth, in the coming, and in the Blessing, Confirmation as well, as in His tabernacle. When He thanks His heavenly Father that He has revealed these things to babes, He sets

forth that further enlightenment and fortifying grace which confirmation brings. He gives them, or recognizes, their special Angels, and did you ever notice too, how when He had fed the great multitude, it is said "so many thousand . . . besides the children"? They are to be brought about Him the Living Bread, and I am glad to say we are to begin our children's mass next Sunday. A celebration which they will follow with hymns. I will send you a paper containing them. And our Lord also delivers childhood. It too comes under the sway of the evil one, and after the Transfiguration He comes down and casts out the devil from the Child. What a type of absolution and its power. The child needs help in its sickness, and Christ must visit it. See Him coming to the daughter. He, the true Resurrection, leads her by the hand; she is restored to life. So the child is set in the midst as a type of Holy orders and of the Ministerial office and power. Whoso receiveth this little child in My Name, receiveth Me. Here is the whole doctrine of the Priesthood. There is the example of active service. He accepts the Bread and fishes from His altar boy ere he blesses the loaves and multiplies them. The little one is a type of union with Himself, which in the adults is symbolized by marriage. This too is the type of perfection. The child the babe, the suckling the fruit of marriage, resting on the heart of God. Whoso will be greatest among you, let him become as the little child. Oh, how could this and more be brought out to children? If I had a chil-

dren's Chapel, as Bishop Dupanloup advised all his clergy to have, I could have an Altar with these pictures over it, worked into window or reredos. The center panel, Christ sleeping on the straw, while above is seen the chalice and Host, and above His sorrow in Calvary. On either side should be representations of Christ in the workshop and Christ in the Temple.

And around the walls in plain designs, these pictures of our Lord's dealings with children. If we are to win the next generation of churchmen, let us begin now and draw the children, in the Eucharist, and in their lives, about the Feet of their own Saviour and Master and Lord and King.

I did not mean to write all this. My sermon is in print. I pray it may do good to many.

How are you getting on? I hope, dear daughter, you are well. Let nothing ever worry you. I fear you may have had some troublesome work or duty of late. I am so glad you have C. M. near at hand. There is so much more to say, but I must stop.

With my love and blessings,

Ever yours in Christ,

C. C. G.

Letters to a Goddaughter

Providence, August 20th, 1903

My dear Godchild:

I don't know when you are going to tackle *Milton*. Your saying that it was on your reading list made me remember I did it many years ago.

I cannot remember much about it. It was one of Macaulay's earliest articles. He wrote it when quite a young man, and it might be called for him a young man's production. He was forming his style. He is fond of antitheses. It makes his thought go off with a snap. It is rather overdone in his earlier articles. Like all great or popular writers he had imitators, just as the great and ponderous Dr. Johnson had. He wrote long-balanced Latinized sentences just the opposite of the modern English style.

Macaulay was a strong partisan and politician. In his essay on Hallam he argued in favor of writing history to defend your own side. Hallam was a very fair and judicious writer. He wrote like a judge. He is not so interesting. Macaulay is picturesque, graphic, and holds one's attention. But he wrote for a purpose. He was what in England was called a Whig in politics, disliked the Stuarts and the Church, and exalted William of Orange.

I read in a tip of him, that he was rather ashamed, but perhaps that is too strong a word, at the way when he wrote his Milton essay, he made such a labored attack on Charles I. He went out of his way to do it as he did.

Charles I. had been brought up with notions of kingly authority, which have now under England's modern Constitutional Government passed away. His Sons, Charles II. and James, I don't respect. But their father was a good man and a martyr.

There had to come a struggle in England for an independent parliamentary Government, and the doing away of the power the King had. Cromwell was the person who led England out of its old feudal condition. Politically we may say that Cromwell represented the idea of popular government which had to come.

In Religion, he and the Puritans were fanatical, and we Churchmen think all wrong.

So here endeth our talk on Milton, or rather this Essay.

Of modern English of to-day in the Church, Canon Newbolt and Dean Paget write the best idiomatic English. Canon Farrar is too exuberantly garish; he writes as if he had dipped his pen into the sunset instead of the inkstand. Liddon was the most vigorous, clear, and forceful, etc.

But then you are not reading sermons except your loving Godfather's, who daily remembers you.

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Providence, The Convent, November 4

My very dear Goddaughter:

Your lovely letter was a bright surprise. It was like a little ray of sunshine that comes dancing into the room.

I think little people can be of much help to older ones if they will try. Old folks like to be considered just as young folks like to be amused.

I was thinking about you a few days before your letter came. It shows how thoughts of others seem to spring up just about at the same time. Maybe some good angel gives us a hint that some friend is thinking of us. I don't know how they give such hints. Perhaps they pull some door bell inside of us and say, "Why, there is your little goddaughter; what can you do for her?" I was looking over a picture book and I thought you might like to have it for a Sunday book. Sunday is the Queen day of the week. It is the most beautiful day, and when we don't have to work or study. It is a day when we want to sing and tell God how good He is, and how happy we are, and how we want to make others good and happy too. So I thought you might like to add another book to your Sunday store. All the pictures are not equally interesting. Mother knows all about them, and so does dear Papa.

Give my love to Charley. I suppose he has grown a good deal, and is just beginning to learn how he can be a help to other persons.

Your affectionate Uncle,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Bishop's House,
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, June 3, 1905

My dear Goddaughter:

All America rises up to bid you welcome home. Being a loyal American I unite. Cheers and the Band.

Having some special claims to send a greeting I do not unite with any one in sending my greeting.

I do it independently on my own accord, with which no one has a right to interfere.

You are welcome back to America and may go where you please, and think as you please, and nearly do everything as you please, except, as I have found, eat what you please. The reasons for this need not be entered in this discourse.

It is a pity we cannot preach about it from the pulpit. The only place where this is done is the chapel of the Health Resort. There, after prayer and reading the scriptures and a hymn, the doctors would give little talks on subjects, at which sometimes the men were present and sometimes not.

It was all very instructive and edifying. I mean "eddyfying" in the right sense and not in Mrs. Eddy's sense.

So I welcome you back to the free, enlightened, prosperous America, where those who have some money and know how to keep and not waste it, can live fairly useful and comfortable lives. We are of course, it is death to say otherwise, in advance of all other countries on the earth, with the exception of the Japs. They are not such hypocrites as we are, our intellectual superiors in warfare, and can vie us out of sight. But all of this is not in the line of welcome nor what I would say in a sermon, but only in the way of letting off steam and giving a screaming whistle, on your arrival.

C. C. Fond du Lac.

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
FOND DU LAC, WISCONSIN, July 5, 1905

MY DEAR GODDAUGHTER:

It was very pleasant to get a letter from you. It seemed full of all the enthusiasm your sojourn abroad had inspired. Seeing all you saw with your eyes you must have had a bright, happy time. Being at Rome is like having a large part of the world's history before you as a great picture book. I am glad you saw the Pope. I don't think your seeing him will do him any harm. You have not an evil eye, but a very good, kindly one. The Pope has a great palace to live in and beautiful gardens, and is surrounded with all the state and etiquette of an earthly king as he claims to be. I never could see why a Bishop should have a Court just like a King. But there are a great many persons in the Church and out of it who like the show and state. I think the Pope would gain more if he gave up his claim to temporal sovereignty and gave himself just to spiritual concerns. I think it would look more like Christianity we read of in the gospels. Our Lord told the Apostles that the princes of this world in their greatness exercised authority and power, but said, "It shall not be so among you." The Bishop of Rome as a Christian Bishop we all much respect. But as connected with the papacy and all it involves, the pomp and power of the Pope seems a rather cowardly thing. Rome makes some converts among snobbily disposed persons, by its glare and glitter, just as some birds are caught or entrapped by broken pieces of shining glass.

Now take good care of your dear self. You had seven great gifts when you were confirmed. They are in you, and you must learn how to use them. There was "the gift of wisdom," by which we know God. We may have some knowledge of Him by our natural powers. But He can illuminate and so dispose our power as to know Him better. "The Spirit of understanding" enlightens us to understand about the Church and Sacraments. "The Spirit of Counsel" guides us in making good decisions as to what is right and what it is best to do. "The spirit of Ghostly strength" makes us strong to do our duty, overcome obstacles, and keeps us calm and from being nervous. "The spirit of knowledge" is a spirit of discretion. It keeps us to be evenly balanced, to keep the golden mean. It considers carefully what ought to be done, and what is the right thing. It does not judge of persons or things superficially. It does not go upon its impressions or conditions or feelings. It is a very discerning, useful spirit.

Then there is the spirit of "True Godliness." Both words worth thinking a bit about. "True," not put on, not outside, not sham, "Godliness" real Goodness and which alone makes life all bright and sunshiny and happy within. Lastly, there is the "Fear of the Lord" which makes us avoid neglect of His service, gives Him the Honor due him, helps us to Reverence and love His worship, and make his life as if surrounded by His Angels and by a wall of fire that keeps us from all evil and harm.

With my love and all bright blessing,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Answer to a Question about Attending a Concert in Holy Week

My dear Daughter in Christ:

Possibly some others asked you the question about the concert, and that you may say what I feel, I send you this.

Would you, if your mother died yesterday and was lying in her coffin, go to Thomas' concert to-day? If we had been one of the women at the crucifixion, what would we have done to-day?

In order that we may be one of the real mourners we must put ourselves in sympathy with them, and enter as fully as we can into that grief.

Yours in Christ,

C. C. G.

April 18, 1911

My dear Goddaughter:

It is indeed sad, very sad, and how much you and the boys and dear Father must feel it. Nothing that we can do can stop the great heartache, but we can try to submit to our Heavenly Father's Will, and as we know Mother does so, our mutual submission tends to unite us more closely together. It's a great comfort to think we may offer the Holy Sacrifice for the rest and peace and advancing felicity of her soul. When our Blessed Lord's tears fell for His friend Lazarus, He knew what human sorrow is, and He will in His own way, and through His dear Sacrament of Love, comfort us. It is not

often realized that through the Sacrament we have a means of communication with those that are gone. For as they are with Him, and we receive Him, our prayers, our acts of submission and love, pass through Him to them. They know we must grieve, but our act of submission carries joy to their hearts.

The loss is a great call, as you realize, to new duties. You have now laid upon you new responsibilities. You must be, of course, as you are, of great help and support to your dear Father. You must, in a way, take Mother's place to the boys. Try to draw them more and more into your confidence, encourage them to come to you both in regard to their troubles, trials, and pleasures. As a sister, you may have more influence with them than you know, to guide them, to keep them in the right path and govern themselves by right principles.

And that you may do this, pray for our Lord's strength and wisdom, for the strength that comes to us through obedience and love.

May Christ be in you the invincible Victor against worldliness, sin, and all temptations. The blessed indwelling power of righteousness, the transforming power, comes from His life. May He glorify you inwardly, and lift you up into a strong and beautiful life, which will unfold at last in the dear Heaven that is to come.

Your loving Godfather,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

July 11, 1912

My dearly beloved Goddaughter:

My heart goes traveling around Europe with you, as you are gathering up beautiful thoughts and lessons of wisdom. The old world is a great picture book, and a great record of the struggles and failures of mankind. How I would like to talk matters and especially Church matters over with you. History, to me, is the great struggle between the good and the evil. You have your own dear part in it to play and are doing it, I believe, well. In the midst of the great whirl of earthly affairs there is one supreme, beautiful, ennobling figure of Christ; take Him more and more fully for your own Saviour and Guide. May your religion be a personal union to a Personal Lord. The radiance from our blessed Lord fills our lives with a beauty and joy and peace nothing else can give.

I am slowly getting better, and hope to be about before very long. But I have suffered a great deal, and have nurses still to take care of me.

Your loving Godpapa,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Letter to a Bishop

Bishop's House,
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, July 23, 1904

My dear Bishop:

In addition to the two enclosed cases Bishop —— deposed the Rev. ——, educated at Sewanee, a College graduate, in middle life, married, and who

verted to Rome. He married a woman of large means, and the consequent worldliness and luxury, together with disappointed ambition, led to the loss of his priestly vocation. This is one of the many cases I have known where marriage, for various causes, has led to a priest leaving our church for the Roman communion. The wife sometimes wants her husband to give up a life which involves such self-restraint and denial.

And now let me, my dear and younger brother, fraternally say that college education has nothing to do with a man's loyalty to God and the Episcopal Church. Some of the most pious, loyal, useful, and God-fearing priests in my diocese have never been to College. Marriage is found to be no security against sensual sins, and in a diocese like mine in many cases it just halves the priest's usefulness and doubles his cares.

The true reasons why so many men leave the ministry are: first, that they have never understood or felt the enormity of sin, or realized their own fatally lost condition, and have been most superficially converted. This I am forced to believe is the condition of many of the clergy, and that the sayings of some of the Fathers is true, that a number, it may be a large one, of the Bishops and priests will be eternally lost. Again, in our seminaries, the students are not taught what vocation signifies, how it is to be discerned and preserved. Their conversion is assumed. The sanctity of the priestly life is not aimed at; they are not properly trained in

the art of meditation and prayer. Especially they are not taught that in Holy Orders the indelible stamp of priesthood is put on their souls, which shall shine forth forever in heaven, or burn on in intolerable torture in hell.

With my sincere and fraternal regards,
Yours in Christ,
C. C. Fond du Lac.

Letter to a Canadian Layman

Bishop's House,
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, August 9, 1904

My dear Sir:

It has not been from lack of interest that I have delayed replying to your letters. I have been absent from my diocese. Partly for that reason, and partly because I had such an accumulation of public work, my answer has been delayed.

In writing as I do, not for publication but private information, I may express myself at times without that fulness of explanation which would belong to a public document. You must, therefore, read my utterances with gentle consideration, and not expect in every phrase scrupulous exactness. It is a busy man's talk to one who has joined himself as a fellow-traveler. If my words can be of any assistance to such an one, I can only say, God be praised.

In respect to those present at the institution of the Lord's Supper, I do not know of any authority that says that any but the Twelve were present. It is true that the title, "Breaking of Bread" came to be given to the Sacrament, but I do not think it

would necessarily follow because our Lord is said to have made Himself known in the action of breaking bread that the incident at Emmaus on the day of the Resurrection was the Lord's Supper. What militates against it is the fact that there was no blessing of the cup, which is an essential part of it, and the recognition of Christ in the breaking of bread is easily referrable to his blessing and breaking at the time of the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves.

My own feeling is that a fair construction of holy scripture shows that our Lord gave command to the Apostles, and the Apostles only, to be His representative officials in celebrating the Eucharist.

You know you began by asking me why, if I held that a layman might baptize, a layman could not celebrate the Communion? While all members of the Church share in a degree in the threefold office of Christ, the Holy Ghost dwelling in the Church and being the authorized exponent of Holy Scripture, and entrusted with the ministrations of the Christian ordinances, has throughout the ages seen fit to make this distinction. The church has allowed laymen to be door-keepers of Christ's kingdom, and administer, where necessity requires, the initial act of baptism, but has reserved to the ordained ministry or priesthood the act of consecration. In my own judgment, and for my own guidance, I have thought it safer to follow the collective wisdom of the Church.

You say that our Lord would know that there

would be little groups of Christians scattered by persecution with no minister present or obtainable, and that you cannot believe that if they, in obedience to Christ's last command, broke bread among themselves, He would not meet them, and that it would not be a valid sacrifice; for, as you argue, we are told He meets those who work righteousness, and that a man who obeys is blessed in his deed, and if there be a willing mind it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. But the question which I think your logical mind will see is this; namely, does a man who does something he is not commanded to do and has not been commissioned to do "obey in his deed"? In the case you suppose, I believe Christ would meet His people, but there would be no need for their celebrating the communion for Him to do so.

The Church meets this case and says in the rubric to the communion of the sick that if for any just impediment persons do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, they are to be instructed that if they do truly repent and believe that Jesus Christ suffered death upon the cross for them, and shed His blood for their redemption, honestly remembering the benefits they have thereby, they do eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to their soul's health, although they do not receive the Sacrament with their mouth.

So Christ would meet the persons whom you describe, and they would not be deprived of the benefit of a communion, but if any one of them should

take on himself the office of priest, he would be breaking God's commandment, for we read that Christ took not on Himself the power of the priesthood, but was called of God as was Aaron; that is, by an outward and visible consecration. For a layman to thrust himself into the priesthood would be to commit the sin of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, a sin which St. Jude warns us against as the "gainsaying of Core." It would be like the sin of Saul, who would not wait for Samuel, the ordained prophet, to come, but offered sacrifice himself, and for his sin the kingdom was taken away from him.

In respect to baptism, I did not intend, when I said we received a seminal principle from the nature of Christ, that baptism only communicated to us a gift and not rather, as you rightly say, we receive Christ Himself.

Christians ought not to let verbal distinctions separate them when they can be fairly explained. Where words are used in different senses, they should strive to understand the sense each other uses.

Now by baptism you seem to understand one thing — "being born" — the deliverance from the state of darkness and entrance into a sphere of light. I am accustomed to join two things together; namely, begetting and being born. For our Lord says we must be born again, i. e. "born from *above*." "Born from above" signifies being born from a heavenly power. The heavenly agent is the Holy Ghost. By prevenient grace, or the grace that goes before the act of baptism, the sinner is by the Holy Ghost

brought to a sight of his sin, its wickedness and guilt, its awful consequences, and is moved to flee from the wrath of God. He is drawn by the love of God, moreover, to embrace the promise of salvation made in Christ. By the power of the Spirit he repents and submits and trusts in Christ for salvation.

This describes imperfectly, of course, the inner state of the converted man. Our Lord's ordained act of outward and visible acceptance of the sinner is baptism. By it Christ seals his acceptance and bestows the forgiveness of his sins. The sinner is born into the kingdom of light; he has received by the power of the Holy Ghost a new nature; he has received by the power of the Holy Ghost of the nature of Christ. He has been buried with Christ in baptism, and is risen in Him. He is clothed with Christ; he has put on Christ. As Eve was taken out of the side of the first Adam, so do we by the Spirit receive this new nature and are taken, as it were, out of the side of Christ. You are quite right in saying that we do not merely receive a gift from Christ. We receive in baptism Christ's very self. No one illustration or analogy tells us of the whole work of baptism. By it we are in Him and He in us. We are gathered into Him and so saved by His merits, and by that same act He cometh into us, communicating His own nature to us.

I simply want to be clear in this, that it is not a mere gift we receive from Christ, but a real incorporation into His nature, and the real communication of His nature to us.

You state that water and spirit are two distinct things, and so would imply that there are two baptisms, one of water and one of spirit.

They are two things when considered separately, but they are not necessarily separate, for in the act of baptism they are united in one act. The sacrament consists of two parts, the outward act consisting of the matter, which is pouring of the water and the words which are the name of the Blessed Trinity, and the accompanying action of the Holy Spirit.

So whatever other objection there might be, it does not follow that they are to be separated, or that there are in the Christian dispensation two such things as "water baptism" and "Spirit baptism," because mentally considered by themselves they are two. The baptism of St. John was not Christian baptism. It was a mere Jewish rite. It was a "water baptism." But Christian baptism is a Sacrament and conveys a gift by the action of the Spirit.

If the Spirit, you state, is always given in baptism, then He cannot blow where He listeth, but must wait on man's convenience. But He bloweth where He listeth, by His prevenient grace drawing men to baptism and converting them, so He does blow where He listeth. But He shows His stability in annexing His promised gift to an ordinance. He does not let His word return to Him void. His gifts are without repentance. He does not let His gift be set at naught by the priest's unbelief. If

the sinner has truly faith and repentance on his part, then Christ not only seals his previous acceptance, but grants him further gifts in baptism.

You say there were no children in the Ark. This is true. But as passing over Jordan into the Holy Land is a type of our passing through death, so the passing through the Red Sea is a type of our entering by baptism upon our Christian course through this world's wilderness. "And they *all*, men, women, and *children*, were baptized in the cloud and in the sea."

Pardon me if I say that in one illustration of yours you have fallen into an unintentional mistake, when you ask, "Was our Lord born again?" (I may have misunderstood you), but the answer is, He never was. Only sinners are required to be born again, and He was sinless. In His baptism two things are signified. By it He formally identified Himself as the second Adam with our condition as a guilty race for whom reparation to God was to be made. It was also His consecration to His Messiahship, in the carrying out of whose triple office of prophet, priest, and king, he was to do it.

Again, our Lord did not become at the time of His ascension a quickening Spirit. The Holy Ghost always possessed and indwelt in His human nature. The Holy Spirit was from the beginning given without measure unto Him. A reason why His humanity could sustain this great gift was because it was connected with His Divine nature. The Holy Ghost dwelling in His perfect humanity gave to it a quick-

ening and life-giving power. You see the contrast between Christ as the second Adam and the first Adam. "The first Adam," as St. Paul says, "was of the earth, earthy: The second man is the Lord from Heaven." The first man was possessed of a living soul. He could propagate life in the natural order. "The second Adam was made a quickening Spirit," one whose humanity was filled with the Holy Ghost, had a quickening and life-giving power, and so he could propagate life in a supernatural way. He referred to this power in the sixth chapter of St. John, when he said: the things I am speaking to you about, namely, My body and My blood, "they are spirit and they are life." And so it was He healed by His own touch or word. A virtue or life went out from Him. The humanity which He united with His divine nature at His birth He has never laid aside. If He had, we should not now possess a High Priest in heaven with human heart like ours, who would be touched with a feeling of our infirmities.

St. John saw Him wearing our human nature, though it was in a glorified condition. And it is by the communication of that humanity to us now through the sacraments, that we are gathered into Him and so eventually attain to eternal life.

Concerning the Holy Communion and my interpretation of the sixth chapter of St. John: you may be correct in beginning the first part of the discourse at verse 27, rather than at verse 32. This is a mere matter of detail.

You ask for an explanation of verse 57: "As

the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live by me." Our Lord, the eternal Son of God, lives by His Father because of the identity of substance with His Father, and in order that we might be united to God the second person became man and partook of our human nature in order that, communicating to us His deified human nature, he might make us partakers of His Divine nature. Our Lord, you notice, does not say that He eats the Father, but He lives by the Father, there being an identity of substance between them. But He uses the word "eat" in respect to us as the means by which His nature can be communicated to us. It is also to be observed that Christ says, who eateth *Me* shall live by Me. His doctrine was not that His flesh should be cut up into infinitesimal pieces and so distributed and carnally eaten, but that He would really and truly and indeed give us His very Body and Blood, together with His soul, that is, His deified human nature, — Christ in His totality — in the sacrament of His love.

I also venture to think that what the Jews stumbled at was not that He was promising them continuance of life here, but how He could give them His flesh to eat, for this is the very way they put their objection, not how can this man give us life, but how can he give us His flesh to eat. And Jesus answered this objection by saying, Does this cause you to stumble? What then if you should behold the Son of Man ascending where He was be-

fore? He was not then and there to give them His flesh to eat. It would be a gift they would receive after His ascension, and so, as elsewhere He said to the Magdalene "Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended," implying that when He had so ascended there should be open a way by which they might indeed touch Him. The Incarnation and its extension to us through the sacraments is, I believe, the very essence of the Gospel, and, when received, opens to souls a vision of the Kingdom of God more beautiful, more entrancing, more spiritually elevating and empowering than any other conception.

Yours very faithfully,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Fond du Lac

Sept. 7, 1889

To the Editor of The Living Church:

May I ask through your columns for the prayers of the faithful that some self-sacrificing, single, and Catholic-minded priests would offer themselves for work in this diocese.

There are 53 parishes and missions and 15 unorganized missions where services have been held. The number of resident and unsuperannuated clergy is 18. Many churches I found closed and some had been so for several years. The people, being unprovided for, have wandered off to other religious bodies, and the children have been gathered into their Sunday schools.

During the past summer, I have, with the aid of the

general missionary and of a few theological students residing with me and going out weekly to different missions, opened 12 churches and established regular services.

This temporary aid must soon come to an end. The success of this limited experiment demonstrates what could be done in a far larger and more permanent way by Catholic clergy imbued with the self-denying and loyal spirit of such men as Mackonochie and Charles Lowder. There are several centers where associated missions could be successfully established. There is one growing and important town now having 14,000 inhabitants where a good church has been built, from which four other towns could be worked. Three of these have churches, and the fourth has bought its church lot. They have raised altogether $1,800.00 or more yearly, which would be sufficient to support three men living in community. This is the only practical way of working this and other districts of so large a diocese; for the church people are few, and the separate parishes not wealthy, and it is trying to the spiritual life of the clergy to live isolated from their brethren. My predecessor felt keenly the peculiar obstacles which confronted him and, after vainly begging for a small endowment of $12,000.00, sank down, not overcome, as he said when dying, by the work, but by the worry and anxiety of his position. What I ask of those Churchmen who realize that success in Church work in the West is the salvation of the spiritual life and faith of the East, is, to pray that

some desirable men would give themselves to the work in this diocese, and some cultured and spiritual women to the missionary society of the Sisterhood of the Holy Nativity who have already begun to labor here.

CHARLES C. GRAFTON,
Bishop of Fond du Lac.

PROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF DEPUTIES

Dec. 28, 1901

TO THE EDITOR OF THE LIVING CHURCH:

THE advocates of proportionate representation are wont to point to the correspondence between our national government with its Senate and House of Representatives, and our House of Bishops with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. They liken the House of Bishops to the Senate, and the House of Deputies to that of the Representatives. But do they not make a fatal mistake in overlooking the fact that the General Convention is composed of three houses and not, as Congress is, of but two? To be sure the clerical and lay deputies sit together, and on many questions vote, for convenience, as one body, but their house is composed of two distinct orders. These assert their independence by voting on all important questions separately, and each has thus a veto on the other. Thus the analogy breaks down. There are three Houses, not two.

Again, the House of Bishops is not in many particulars like the United States Senate. In the latter

case the Senators are chosen by their State legislatures and represent their respective States. The Bishops, on the other hand, are not elected to the General Convention. They are not chosen by their Dioceses to represent them. They do not represent Dioceses. They do not come, as Senators do, for a term of years. They come there by virtue of their Order, of their prerogative as Bishops of the Church of God. They all have equal rights, whether Diocesan Bishops or Missionary Bishops, Coadjutors or Suffragans. They all belong to that same Order to which by Divine authority the government of the Church is primarily committed. So again the supposed analogy breaks down.

If there is any likeness in our General Convention to the secular government it is to be found in this: that the House of Deputies is like the Senate. It is utterly unlike the House of Representatives, for its members are not chosen by districts or by the people. Nor are the clergy chosen by the clergy of the Diocese to which they belong and so are their representatives, nor are the lay delegates chosen by the laity and so made their representatives. They are both chosen by their Diocesan Conventions or Councils, and so represent the Dioceses, just as Senators represent their States.

Experience has demonstrated the wisdom, in our civil polity, of having a governing body whose members represent the States and whose numbers are not based upon proportionate representation. The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies is this body in

our Church and it would be as un-American to try to overthrow it as to overthrow State rights and State sovereignty and the system of their representation in our national government.

But this plea for proportionate representation is based upon a more grave mistake. It is based upon a worldly-minded and un-Christian policy. It is the evidence of a worldly mind to urge that numbers of communicants or amount of contributions should be taken into account. The deputies are not to represent either wealth or numbers. Like the Bishops, though elected, they represent both the Diocese that sends them (and so each Diocese sends the same number) and also their Order. The clergy represent the clerical Order; the laity, who are in their degree kings and priests unto God, represent their Order. The two do not come together to represent the people as the House of Representatives does. They represent, irrespective of the number who may have voted for them, or the wealth of their Dioceses, their own respective orders. As Church legislation does not represent and is not intended to represent the mind of the majority of the Church members, there is no need of any house for that purpose. Herein is a difference between civil government and Church government. In civil matters we are governed, or supposed to be, by the will of the majority. It is not so in the Church of God. We are governed, or seek to be governed in Church affairs, by the Mind and Will of God. To this end the Holy Spirit dwells in the Church and

presides in its councils. What a Church council seeks by its debates and votes to ascertain is, not the mind of the majority of its Church members, but the Mind of the Spirit. Now the Mind of the Spirit is seen by making men to be of one mind in an house. It is by the agreement of the Bishops, the clergy, and the laity, acting separately, that this Mind is shown. The plan of proportionate representation, in order that the voice of the majority may be learned, is then based upon a false principle. It is the endeavor to reconstruct the city of God upon the earthly principles of the city of Babylon.

The system proposed would moreover tend to increase one of the worst features of the American Church. Its worst feature is the political spirit, with its ambitions and popularity-seeking and maneuvering. That our whole system of elections engenders schools of theology many be beneficial, but party, or the political spirit, is a deadly thing. It would come to pass under proportionate representation that a few great Dioceses would control the Convention. Even if these were groups of Dioceses the evil would be the same or worse. It would lead to the Boss system, or government by bosses and cliques. It would increase a spirit harmful and dangerous and in marked contrast with the ways of God.

C. C. Fond du Lac.

The Holy Eucharist

January 15, 1902

To the Editor of The Living Church:

A correspondent in your January number, after referring to my Tract on the Holy Eucharist, asks me two questions: "Does the Bishop mean to imply that by the act of consecration the Body of Christ is made by the priest?" Our answer is in the negative. No, he does not. The next question is, "Does he mean to say that by the invocation of the priest the real Body and Blood of Christ are brought from the right Hand of God the Father Almighty and placed on the altar, etc.?" Again, the answer is in the negative.

The questions of your correspondent show that gross misunderstanding exists concerning the doctrine of the Real Presence as taught by the Catholic School of Churchmen. In the interests of Christian charity and of that unity amongst ourselves, upon which the future usefulness of our beloved Church so much depends, let me try to explain this matter.

The first difficulty to be cleared up relates to Christ's Ascension. What is meant when the Apostles, St. Paul and St. Peter say, "He is at the right hand of God?" God is not a Being having material or corporeal parts, a right hand or a left hand. God is everywhere, for all things created are in Him. He is indeed "above all," being separate from all, but is by His Omnipotence and Omnipresent Energy "through all and in us all."

The Son of God made man is now reigning in that Human Nature, with its glorified and spiritual Body, which has been gathered into union with the Godhead, and made partaker of His power. "Christ," says Bishop Pearson, "is said to sit down at the right hand of the Father in regard of that absolute Power and Dominion which he hath obtained in heaven." Our Lord Himself declared this truth, saying, "Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit at the right hand of the Power of God." It means that He is gathered into it and shares in it as the angels do not. While, therefore, although our Lord's glorified Humanity is not by itself omnipresent, yet by virtue of its union with the omnipotent Deity, Christ can, without its involving any change of locality, make Himself and His Blessed Body present where he will. St. Stephen saw Him as in heaven, St. Paul in the roadway.

This answers the two questions. The priest does not by consecration make a new Body, nor is Christ "brought" down nor in any material way does He move.

For the further aid of those who seek not controversy but are willing to be taught by the Spirit let me try and explain something further concerning this Blessed Mystery of condescending Love.

Christ founded His Church and it was made a living organism on the day of Pentecost. He did not go away from it at His ascension. Many persons make this mistake. They think of Him as gone off to some distant locality. He did not, however, go

away from His Church, but remained within it. This He declared He would do. He would not only send the Holy Spirit, but "*I* will not leave you comfortless. *I* will come to you." The Spirit was not to come to take the place of an absent Lord, but "*I* will be with you always unto the end of the world." "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am *I* in the midst of them." Thus He went away, by an ascension to the Right Hand of Power. He went from a visible companionship with all the collected Apostles, that He might be with each of them and their successors and all His followers as they became separated in all lands. Remaining, He dwells in His Church, which is a temple of living stones, a spiritual organism of which He is the Light and Life. What Almighty God is to the material universe, that the Son-Man is to this new spiritual creation. The Light and Life go out from Him and His Humanity to bless and sustain every member of it. It is by the ordained means of the sacraments that the Light and Life are communicated to us. It is by the Holy Spirit that dwells in the Church that those sacraments are made effectual signs and instruments of grace and our hearts by repentance, faith, and love are prepared beneficially to receive them. So it comes to this: That Christ stands in the midst of His Church, ever present to all within it. He now, as when He stood at the Holy Table at the Last Supper, takes, by means of His authorized agents and ministers, the Bread and Wine, and by His

Word and Spirit gathers them into union with Himself and calling them after their divine engrafting declares them to be His Body and Blood. That Body indeed can never again be broken or that Blood again be shed, and so the priest in giving the sacrament says "the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ," "the Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given and shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul to everlasting life." But that which is not only received, but "given" and "taken," though in this heavenly and spiritual manner, is as our articles declare "The Body of Christ."

It would greatly aid concord amongst Churchmen of all schools if they would realize what these words "heavenly and spiritual" signify. They mean in their deepest, fullest sense that the whole transaction of the Eucharist takes place in the Kingdom of Heaven and by the power of the Holy Spirit. The whole transaction is done — not in the *material*, natural world, but in the spiritual organism or Kingdom of Christ. Every person and thing and act and word connected with the Oblation, Consecration, Reception belongs to this spiritual Kingdom and makes the whole transaction, from first to last, in all its processes and gift, a divinely spiritual one. How the outward sign and inward gift are united is a mystery which cannot be explained by any natural law or by human philosophy. The Gift cannot properly be assented to be "under" or "in" or "below" or "above," or by any like terms which necessarily denote locality. Taking our blessed

Lord's words literally, all we can say is: it is a Mystery, the work of the Spirit, and that the two parts are sacramentally and supernaturally identified.

But while that which is present and the sphere of that Presence, and the Power by which it is effected, and the persons, priests and people — all belong to the spiritual order, yet it does not follow that Christ, in the totality of His two natures, is not present (or He is not otherwise) by virtue of the consecration and the Spirit's power.

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Reminiscences

May 9, 1903

To the Editor of The Living Church:

The Catholic party has in the course of its eventful history made its mistakes. It has, however, never been unwilling to recognize them when kindly pointed out by friend or foe. Our cause has been too great not to be able to bear criticism, and too precious not to be willing to avail ourselves of it.

Having for more than fifty years been closely identified with it in America and England, let me, with the open acknowledgment of my own blunders and inferiority to many of my juniors, give your readers the result of some of my observations and experience.

The Tractarian movement under its earliest leaders was one of notably great learning and holiness. No one could be with such men as Pusey, Keble, Marriott, or Carter but felt he was in the

presence of saints. But in its earlier manifestations the movement was largely academical. It touched mostly the intellectual, the scholars, the refined. But it did not reach the masses. Then a day came when an intense missionary spirit was kindled and Catholics began that wonderful work among the poor in the East of London of which Charles Lowder and Mackonochie were such notable leaders. Along with this popular missionary work Ritual began to be more strikingly developed than it had previously been.

There was always from the beginning a class of the Tractarians who devoted themselves to the study of the ancient liturgies, architecture, and ceremonial. The Cambridge-Camden Ecclesiological Society took in this department the lead. Much had been done in the improvement of the interior of the old churches. All Saints', Margaret Street, had been built and was looked on as a sort of Catholic Mecca. But in the later fifties and early sixties there was a much greater ceremonial development. The common folk could not read the learned treatises which established the continuity of the English Church with the past, or the validity of her orders, or the sacramental life she possessed. It had to be brought home to them by ritual as an object lesson.

And so, based upon the ornaments rubric which stood at the beginning of the office of Morning Prayer, the practical missionaries of that day revived the vestments and lights and ceremonial

that the English Church by this rubric claimed as her inheritance. Whenever it was tried along with faithful parish work, and with the deep evangelical spirit of the early pioneers, great marvels were wrought and the English Church began to regain its hold on the masses, especially the poor.

But now came a trial. The Low Church party were held in the grip of their inherited Calvinistic or Puritan theology. They were intense partisans and had succeeded in getting a worldly Prime Minister to fill most of the Bishoprics with Low Churchmen. They saw, and would see, nothing in the Tractarian movement but an approach to Rome. It was undoing the work of the blessed Reformers. It was reëstablishing priestcraft and was a retrogression to the Dark Ages. And by inflammatory appeals to the Englishman's inherited prejudices against Rome they lashed the popular mind into a white heat of hatred and distrust. The poor Tractarians were seeking like Wesley to save souls. They were working for Christ and were trying to develop a higher standard of holiness. They were setting the example in the midst of a worldly age, of entire consecration and self-sacrifice. Their watchword was the Bible and the Prayer Book; the Bible the Word of God, the Prayer Book its interpreter. But it did not matter. The mark of the scarlet woman was on them. So the Bishops thundered opposingly in their charges, and the world's great organ, the "London Times," never ceased to rage against them. Under the stress some were

driven, as Newman had been before, to Rome. But in the sixties and there along, there were not so many secessions, save of inferior persons and some fashionables whom Manning, the great apostle to the "Genteels," captivated.

But in the development of their onward ritual movement some of our good men made a grievous tactical blunder. They went on too fast in their ritual development. Mackonochie, to whom all honor belongs for his noble, self-sacrificing life, "felt," as Canon Woodford, afterward Bishop of Ely, said to me — "the pulse of his congregation but not of the Church. The Church was ready for an advance on the ritual of All Saints', but was not prepared for what Fr. Mackonochie introduced."

Some of us here in America have made the same mistake. We have thought what it was possible to do in our own parishes and have not considered whether we might not be endangering the whole cause. It requires much judgment so to advance as to draw more with us than we drive back. Mackonochie and his friends went ahead and developed a ritual that at the time startled the Church. It might have succeeded if his friends had not asserted, and in seemingly defiant tones, that this was the *legal* ritual; that it was the legal ritual authorized by the rubric, the legal ritual that all true Churchmen were bound to obey.

It was this attitude that created the opposing Church Association. I always thought we were partly to blame for its existence. For this attitude

simply made the Low Churchmen mad. And no wonder. It was as much as saying, *nolens volens*, you, too, have got to wear all these abominable and popish vestments. So, as fighting for their very existence, the Church Association arose and appealed to the Law.

Now the Ritualists were able and learned men, and especially skilled in the history of the Prayer Book, but they were Englishmen, and insular and obstinate at that. The ornaments rubric declared that vestments and altar lights and incense were legal. Our friends started in with that conviction. I remember in the fifties, being then a student of law at Harvard, examining the question and coming to the same conclusion some great English lawyers subsequently did. I believed the six points were part of our lawful heritage.

But our English friends made one mistake. They were Englishmen, and had a great belief that justice would be rendered in their courts of law. What was law would of course be decided to be law. Now courts of last resort in all countries, in France, in the United States, and in England, when political or religious questions are involved, do not decide according to law. They have not done so since the days of Pontius Pilate. These courts are governed by policy. Some have a theory that, being courts of last resort, they may usurp legislative functions, but it is scarcely defensible. Anyway, so it turned out in England. The Privy Council, whose judges are selected, was packed with persons known, like the

Presbyterian Judge Collins, to be of a hostile mind. The notorious Lord Westbury was another member. The decision in one instance was so in violation of justice, that one of its members, Chief Baron Kelly, publicly proclaimed it was a decision governed by policy. The decisions became contradictory and were afterwards riddled by experts. But we Ritualists were to blame for not knowing, or not believing when told, that the decisions were bound to be not according to law, but to public opinion.

The Ritualists played the game badly. They ought to have deferred a legal contest till they were stronger. But they did not accept the cautions given them by Pusey and older men. They should have acted more unitedly, and advanced more together, and not have joined horns in legal battle till they had got a public moral backing of some weight behind them. Well! we got beaten in the English Law Courts, and badly beaten, and for nigh twenty years the movement sagged and suffered. Then came the deliverance.

The (Low) Church Association had wisely, up to this time, picked out for attack churches whose Rectors had little standing. They attacked, for instance, Purchas of Brighton, who was a florid Ritualist, and then attacked a precocious young Ritualist whose name was Ridsdale. The Church Union was forced into their defense. The old Tractarian leaders among themselves regretted the unwisdom of these men, but they could not help themselves. These advanced Ritualists, not caring

for others, threw the match into the powder magazine. The Church Association won their triumph over them. But, flushed by success, at last the Church Association ventured to attack the saintly Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. King. Then Archbishop Benson took the matter into his own hands, and sweeping away the Privy Council's authority and decisions, gave a judgment which allowed of a use of lights and vestments and the mixed chalice, and so gave new life to a beaten cause.

Upon this, our friends acted with their usual unwisdom. In London a few, without any reference to their Bishop, with whom as Catholics they knew the *jus liturgicum* resides, began to introduce new and additional services. One had Benediction, one the saying of the Rosary, another the Roman offices for Holy Week. They began to have a wild time generally. We are Catholics and believe no national Church can contradict the utterances of undivided Christendom. But has any priest a right to introduce any service in addition to those in the Prayer Book without at least the tacit assent of the Ordinary? But our friends, shouting out, "Catholicity, not Anglicanism," went their own way. Not a little that frightened the public was the unwise negotiation with Rome. No wonder the English public went mad. No wonder a Kensit arose. No wonder the Archbishops decided against the use of incense. No wonder that the British Parliament has brought in a new drastic Church Discipline Bill. Our extremists in England have just steered their ship on the rocks.

God, who had delivered the people again, and again, may allow and overrule all this to a readjustment of the relations of the Church and State. But we Ritualists have chiefly to blame ourselves for the disaster.

The mischief is done, in England. The question for us in America is, Shall we follow the lead of those who have brought such disaster upon the English Church?

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Bishop Kozlowski and the Quadrilateral

February 9, 1907

To the Editor of The Living Church:

I had not before heard that the mode of administering the Sacrament by the Old Catholic Polish Church had been a ground of objection to entering into Christian fellowship with them. It never came up in any official dealings with Bishop Kozlowski, and he would not, I believe, have objected, had it been made a condition of conforming to our custom. Indeed he did so on some occasions. The feast of St. John is one of special observance by the Poles and in his church the Sacrament was administered in both kinds. It is fair to presume he would have done it always if asked to by us whose advice and counsel he sought. Administration in both kinds was commonly done, I know, in one of his churches. The Old Catholics in Europe, of which his organization was a part and by whose Bishops he had been consecrated, give the Communion in both kinds.

I have three congregations of the Old Catholics (French) under my jurisdiction, and the same rule obtains. We should remember and make allowance for the fact that under Bishop Kozlowski the large body of Poles were being led out of Romanism and were in a transition state.

The objection raised by some was that in putting forth the Quadrilateral, we were only stating the preliminaries to a conference and that we should in practice demand much more than an acceptance of them. It was argued that we ought to have an authoritative statement of the faith of anybody seeking fellowship with us. In response a series of articles was drawn up and adopted in Synod by the Polish Old Catholics. I subjoin a copy. You may have published them before. But as such matters are quickly forgotten, I would respectfully ask their reinsertion. If we can bear in our communion with Pusey and Keble and Liddon and all of that school of Churchmanship, I do not see why we could not have allowed intercommunion between ourselves and these Old Catholics.

It is true that the opposition of Bishop McLaren had something to do with the failure. But with all respect to his great ability and theological learning, he, like some others, did not look kindly on any who left the Roman obedience. He thought they ought to stay where they were. He had no sympathy with the Old Catholic movement and consequently was opposed to Bishop Kozlowski. But if the Old Catholics had no right to break with the Papacy,

neither had we, and I venture to think his ground was not in accord with the spirit of the Quadrilateral.

Concerning the latter, its third condition is somewhat ambiguous. It requires that there shall be in the administration of the Lord's Supper "the unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution and of the elements ordained by Him." I think the general teaching of Catholic Christendom is that the priest in the prayer of consecration should purpose to do what Christ did. Our own words of consecration seem to be descriptive of what He did, rather than a repetition of the exact words He used. Does any part of the Church claim to know or use the words just as Christ spoke them? Then as to the elements, the condition was chiefly to guard against the practices of those who substitute water or grape juice or who do not use proper bread. While so far agreed as to the requisites of a valid consecration as to the administration of the Sacrament, the Catholic Church is not so unanimous. The Eastern Church administers by intinction. The Roman to the laity under one species. We may hold ours the better and more scriptural way, but it would be temerarious to say that the Roman laity did not receive Christ. And if this is the more charitable opinion, is it right for us to make the mode of administration a condition of intercommunion? I am loath to believe this is the determined position of our Church and the meaning of our peace-loving and peace-making Quadrilateral. It would make the re-

establishment of intercommunion with the East and West an impossibility.

Allow me to say one word for Bishop Kozlowski. I had much intercourse with him. He was a well-read theological student, a man of marked sincerity, one who made great sacrifices in leaving Rome, who was notedly humble and most responsive to advice, who lived in great poverty and self-denial, who had heavy burdens to bear and was incessantly attacked and plotted against, who suffered as few are called to do. He could not but feel the way his overtures and himself were treated by us. For one I am thankful his life of toil and suffering is over. He was a Christian hero and a devoted servant of God.

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Children at the Eucharist

August 31, 1907

To the Editor of The Living Church:

One regrets to find any one so narrow-minded as to forbid the presence of children at the Eucharist. But loyal Churchmen, one would think, would be willing to be guided by the Prayer Book. When children are baptized their sponsors are bidden to have them "hear sermons." Now the only place where sermons are ordered by the Prayer Book is in the Communion service. Surely if, in obedience to the order in the Prayer Book, children are taken to that service, has a Bishop a right to forbid their presence at it? As there is no provision for the withdrawal of any, they have a right to stay through.

The spiritual advantages to the children are very great, and we encourage in our diocese what are called children's Eucharists, but here we are merely pointing out the illegality of forbidding their attendance.

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Reservation of the Sacrament

May 28, 1910

To the Editor of The Living Church:

Let me present my thanks to you for the stand you have taken about the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the Sick. And also, I would express my thanks to your correspondent from Burlington, for saying that "the ancient and Catholic practice of carrying the sacrament from the Church to the dying ought to be restored." The position, however, which your learned correspondent and exact scholar takes is that the individual priest is acting in a lawless way if he does so. But one thing we may claim; he does nothing that contradicts the teaching of the Twenty-ninth Article of Religion, which says: "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved." This statement is meaningless and unintelligible, in your correspondent's opinion, if Reservation were still allowed. But in an office used in Scotland we find a rubric expressly allowing of Reservation, and in the same book bound up with it, the Thirty-nine Articles, we have this testimony of one of our sister Churches that it is not so. Moreover, our own Church, although the sacrament for other purposes than Com-

munion was not ordained by Christ, yet in her devotional spirit, bringing like the wise householder new things out of old—our own Church reserves the Blessed Sacrament after the Communion of the people and orders devotional exercises of prayer and praise in Its presence. The change of the Gloria in Excelsis from the beginning to the end of the office witnesses to this pregnant fact.

I, at one time, had the same feeling about the matter as your correspondent, and I can sympathize with his strong condemnation of the practice. But some time ago I was led to consider the subject from a judicial standpoint. Suppose a priest should be presented to me for having broken the Church's law by reserving: what ought my decision to be? Such a person would be entitled to have the rubric strictly construed and as far as possible in his favor. This would be the law in the criminal cases. I came to the conclusion that, according to its strict and legal construction, the rubric did not forbid Reservation for so lawful a purpose as Reservation for the sick.

Let me state some of the reasons for my judgment.

We are bound first to consider what is the intention of the rubric as derived from an analsyis of the rubric itself.

Clearly its intention is to prevent any irreverence to the consequent elements, such as the Protestant clergy at that time (1662) would be likely to show. These ministers were exceedingly clever and subtle in their mode of evading the Church's orders. They had, during the Great Rebellion, substituted tables

for the altars, which they had moved out into the middle of the Church, and round about which they sat as if the Lord's Supper were but a meal, and they did many things to profane the sacrament. The Church, having gained her rights at the time of the Restoration, proceeded to review the Prayer Book. Among other additions she put in this rubric evidently to prevent Puritan profanation. Its purpose cannot legally be shown by an appeal to the private opinions of the compilers, but only to the rubric itself.

First. It makes a distinction between the elements which remained unconsecrated and those which were consecrated. The unconsecrated the curate might have for his own use. It did not matter what he did with it. It was only common bread and wine. But the consecrated was to be differently treated. The rubric meets, one by one, all the subterfuges to which the Puritans might resort to profane the Blessed Presence. If it had said simply, "It shall be consumed," the Puritan might and would say, "I'll take it home and consume it there." Therefore it was forbidden to carry it "out of the church." It was to be consumed in the sacred building. The crafty Puritan might say again he would do this, but he "would wait half an hour until all the people had gone." Therefore he was ordered to consume it "immediately." It was to be done immediately after the blessing, and so was in this way made a part of the service.

Another manufactured excuse, and which I have

sometimes heard, might be that the amount left in the chalice was so large that it made it dangerous or intemperate for the priest to consume it. In view of this it was ordered that the priest and "such other communicants as he shall then call," shall consume what remains. But still our Puritan evader would manifest his belief, and do irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament by calling up his sympathizing friends, who, with hats on, and by irreverently talking to one another, would manifest their unbelief and hatred of the Christian doctrine. It was therefore further ordered that they should "reverently" eat and drink the same. They were to receive it "reverently," i.e., in the same way it had been given in the Communion. No one can study the rubric fairly without seeing that the object was to prevent irreverence, and guard the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

This then being the intention, as proved from the rubric itself, how shall we construe it? Let us judicially consider this. Now it is a law of legal construction that laws and, we may say, rubrics should be construed by the intention for which they were formed. The intention should come in as a governing principle of construction. The law or rubric should not, if it be possible, be enlarged beyond the intention. Is it possible then so to construe the rubric as to conform and confine it to its obvious purpose? We think it can be so construed. Your correspondent says, "the words of the rubric are free from ambiguity." We venture to join issue

with him. The words of the rubric are free from obscurity, but not from ambiguity. Ambiguity, in legal language, connotes that the words may be taken in two senses. This, we believe, is the case here. The words that "the bread and wine remaining shall not be carried out of the church, but the minister and other communicants shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same," may be taken either as mandatory or directory. The words may be taken as mandatory, that is commanding that they shall in all cases be consumed; or as directory, stating, if consumed, this is the manner in which it shall be done.

The word "shall" does not determine which of these two is here to be taken. It is often used in common law in statutes not in a mandatory, but in a declaratory and directory sense. We have an instance of this in the Holy Communion office itself. A rubric reads: "Then shall follow the sermon." Common sense and custom have always interpreted this not to mean there shall always be a sermon, but that then, or here, it shall follow.

Another instance we find in the very rubric itself. The rubric says "the minister and other communicants (as he shall then call) shall" consume. Now I would ask my revered correspondent: Suppose at the end of the service he finds a very small portion of the Precious Blood left in the chalice; what does he do? What has been his practice? Has he not always consumed it himself, and by himself? Has he thought it necessary in order to obey the rubric

to call up any of the communicants? But the rubric clearly states that it is the "minister and other communicants" whom he shall call who shall consume what remains. He has thus decided that the word "shall" here is to be taken in a directory sense. It leaves him a discretion. He shall call communicants if he think it necessary.

Thus the rubric ordering that what remains "shall not be carried out of the church," may be taken in a like directory sense, not forbidding the priest to carry the Blessed Sacrament out if need so require it, to any sick person.

But, moreover, the American rubric has been altered from that in the English Prayer Book. In the English book we have a direction concerning that which remains of what was consecrated "at the end of the service." Now the American rubric alters this, and the alteration must have its legal significance. It does not bid the consumption of that of the consecrated elements which remains "at the end of the service," as the English book does, but "that which remains after the Communion." Why the change? We submit the reason.

Our office was taken from the Scotch, which allows of Reservation, and refers to others than those present in her canon when she prays "that we and all others who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive," etc. In our American consecration prayer, we too thus refer to others than those present who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion. Others than those present,

then, are to receive. The Prayer Book also makes a distinction between the service as a whole, called the Holy Communion, and the service as finished when the communicants have received, called "the Communion."

In page 522 we have the rubric with these words: "The Communion being done, a certain prayer is to be said." This shows the "Communion" may be done before the whole service is ended, and so our rubric does not require the consumption of what remains at the end of the service as the English does, but the consumption of what remains after the "Communion," which may be "done" before the service is ended. This gives meaning to the prayer of Consecration which refers to the receiving of others than those present, and allows for Reservation. For the priest, after the consecrating prayer, may put aside some of the consecrated species in reservation for those who are absent, and with what remains, communicate those present. Of that which remains, after the communion of the people — "the Communion" — but which he has set aside for those absent, and thus remains at the end of the service, he may keep for the Communion of the sick.

To all this it may be said, Do you think this was the intention of the framers of the English, or of our rubric? I reply, I do not know; but whether it was their intention or not, clergymen should learn this great rule of construction, that the private intention of legislators can never be cited in the interpretation of a law. It does not matter whether they

were on the majority or the minority side. Laws and rubrics are the result of the conferences or debate. Into the law has passed the mind of the different sides or different members of the legislative body. The law is the utterance of the entity. So it may come to pass that a law might be meaningless or contain that which never entered into the head of any of its makers to formulate. As loyal Churchmen we are not to be governed by the private intention of the sixteenth century divines, but to interpret our Prayer Book as Catholic inheritors of the ancient Catholic faith and practice.

C. C. Fond du Lac.

The Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament

June 18, 1910

To the Editor of The Living Church:

I am glad to say I agree with a good deal of your correspondent, and especially with the spirit of loyalty manifested to our Book of Common Prayer. *For my own part, I have never knowingly violated the commands of any rubric, or found any necessity of doing so.* I must, however, record my conviction that the honest, unprejudiced, and true legal construction of the rubric in respect to the consumption of the elements allows of reservation.

In this holding, I do not stand alone, but believe I am in conformity with an inherited tradition in our Church. In my young clerical days, I was assistant of the venerable Dr. Wyatt of St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, who was a President of our House of

Deputies, and whose ministry extended over the first half of the last century. It was his custom to reserve the Blessed Sacrament. It was also the custom, I have been informed, of the Rev. Dr. Craik, of Kentucky. I had, at that time, a question in my own mind as to the legality of the practice, and consulted with the Rev. Dr. Hawkes, a distinguished canonist, and a Low Churchman, whom I well knew. He assured me that Reservation was an allowed custom in our Church. Afterwards, when a priest in charge of a large city parish, I carried the Blessed Sacrament to a sick communicant, lying in a ward of the hospital. I reported the case to my Diocesan, Bishop Paddock, who admitted the propriety of the action. When a chaplain in a cholera hospital in London, my co-worker and assistant, Fr. O'Neil, carried the Blessed Sacrament to the sick, with the knowledge and permission of the then Bishop of London, subsequently Archbishop Tait. I believe this was allowed in the yellow fever outbreak some years ago at Memphis, and that there are many instances to be found where this ancient custom of the Church has been observed. My interpretation therefore of the rubric is one fortified by custom.

I agree, of course, with Dr. Evans and Vattel, and I might add Hooker, that where the language is plain, the literal interpretation is to be taken. This principle applies to the statement of facts in the Creed. There is no ambiguous or twofold meaning in their statements. Thus the argument of your correspondent, that my principle might be applied

to a perversion of the facts in the Creed, falls to the ground.

As I said, the language of the rubric is plain, but it is ambiguous. There is this ambiguity in it: it may be taken in one of two senses — a mandatory, or a merely directory one. This is a well-known and established legal principle of construction of statute law. It is one recognized by and acted upon in our Church. This is seen in the language of the rubric itself, which requires the priest to consume the elements with such other persons as he shall call. It does not enforce his calling them, but leaves it to his discretion. We would also cite another rubric. In the Prayer Book, before the last revision, at the end of the consecrating prayer, there was this rubric, "Here shall be sung a hymn." We would respectfully ask our brother correspondent if he never celebrated the Holy Communion in his life without having a hymn sung in that place. Did any one every object, on his omitting it, that he was violating his ordination vows? Or did his sensitive conscience ever accuse him of doing so? The distinction we have thus pointed out is clearly recognized by law and common practice.

Now the question is: Which of these two interpretations of the rubric is to be adopted? Is it to be taken as a command and prohibiting Reservation, or as a direction of how, when consumed, it is to be done. We would give three reasons why it should be in favor of the liberal one which allows Reservation.

I. We have proved and demonstrated from the rubric itself that its intention is to preserve the reverence due to the consecrated elements. Now in choosing between the two interpretations, that one should be taken which conforms to the intention of the rubric, and does not extend it beyond its scope, as forbidding Reservation would do.

II. Another reason is this: The priest, to use theological language, has jurisdiction over the Sacramental Body of our Lord. It is part of his "sacerdotal functions," given him by the Prayer Book, to administer it to all his people. It is his inherent right as priest to carry it thus to those of his congregation who are sick and dying. The rubric therefore must be construed in such a way as not to limit his inherent right, and therefore it does not forbid Reservation.

III. There is also the law of charity and common sense. Without Reservation, in many cases, it is impossible for him to perform his ministerial duties.

The provision for a celebration in the house of the sick does not meet the requirements of the case. An instance similar to that cited by Dr. —— of one dying before being able to receive, occurred in my own ministration. I was called to give the Blessed Sacrament to a dying Union soldier. I celebrated with all expedition possible, but he passed away before he could receive. The necessity not only applies to the condition of the sick, many of whom cannot bear the strain of a service, but also to the priest himself. He may be called to administer

to a person with a terrible contagious disease. He could not celebrate, and after, consume the elements, without danger to his own life. Charity and common sense therefore thus determine the interpretation in favor of Reservation.

Moreover, I would earnestly and lovingly ask all to consider what would be the judgment of the Blessed Master, and which of these two interpretations He would commend. We surely remember the righteous indignation with which he scornfully rebuked those who forbade His loving act of mercy, upon the ground that it technically violated a literal construction of an ecclesiastical rule. Would he not utter the same terrible denunciation upon those who would forbid carrying the Blessed Sacrament of His love to His sick and dying members on the ground of a narrow interpretation of the letter of a rubric, and which construction was not in accordance with its spirit? Can we doubt for an instance which of the interpretations the Blessed Master would take? And in His Name, and for His people's sake, I would plead for its adoption.

There is one further matter I would humbly and most lovingly bring before our friends. Why disturb the Church with this controversy? Reservation is not forced on any one. Why should those who have found it useful not be allowed to keep it? Why should the peace of the Church be disturbed by proposed legislation concerning it? We are supposed to be all praying for Christian Union. Should not unity and harmony in our own Church

be the first and paramount consideration? All schools have lived together in peace for many years; why not, with Gamaliel-like wisdom, leave things alone? Why should the hearts of so many hundreds of priests and devout laity be disturbed by those harassing and unsettling disputes? Cannot we all live, High, Low, and Broad Churchmen, together, in a spirit of Christian fellowship?

May the coming General Convention not be one which will increase strife and division, but be characterized by large-hearted Christian charity and harmony! Why cannot the dominant party look upon us Catholics as weaker brethren, if they will, and bear with us, and not strive to make it more difficult for pious souls to remain in our Communion? If love to one another, and forbearance with one another, should govern the action of our coming General Convention, the Church would better do its work in saving souls, in bringing souls to Christ. May Almighty God in His Infinite Mercy take pity upon the poor, Protestant Episcopal Church, staggering under the blows it received at the last Convention, and preserve it from further harm!

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Christ's Resurrection and Ours

June 17, 1911

To the Editor of The Living Church:

There seems to be some confusion of thought amongst good Church people respecting both our Lord's Resurrection and our own.

I. Our Lord's Resurrection was a real bodily one and not a mere subjective one in the minds of the Apostles. We are thus bound to believe in its reality. A modern German theory that His Resurrection was simply a revival of His spiritual influence and old teachings in the minds of His Apostles is not in accordance with Holy Scripture. It is disproved by the fact that our Lord greatly added to His former teachings; and during the great Forty Days revealed the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, His mediatorial royalty and reign, instituted the sacrament of Baptism, gave the great Commission to the Apostles, and promised to be with them to the end of all days. This fuller teaching as declared by the Apostles shows that they were possessed of something more than Christ's former instructions. This possession of new and most important truths gained from the risen Lord proves that the Resurrection was not a mere subjective remembrance of only former teaching.

II. The Body that rose was identical with that which was crucified. Some have denied this. They have taught that the Body which was laid in the tomb in some unexplained way disappeared, and that a new spiritual body took its place. We are asked, these critics say, to believe in the actual resuscitation and reappearance of a physical body. Now the identity of the Crucified with the risen Body is proved among other evidences by the wounds in Christ's Hands and Feet and Side.

It does not follow, because the risen Body was

now controlled by its spiritual nature, that it was not the same body. Herein our critics make a logical error. Another more important one lies in supposing that our Lord rose from the dead in the same way that Lazarus rose. Now Christ did not come back to His former condition of life as Lazarus did, but conquering death, passed through it, and issued forth into a new condition of life. The Resurrection is not the story of how a dead man came to life again, but how the God-Man, who is the Resurrection and the Life, conquered death. He became thereby the Head of a new Order of Life.

Herein, too, we see why our Lord did not appear to His enemies. It would have done them no good, for as before, they would have ascribed, if they accepted it, His Resurrection to the work of Beelzebub. But the true reason why He did not appear to His enemies was because He had finished that portion of His prophetical work. Just as in the order of nature the geological periods do not repeat themselves, but Creation moves on, God ever building on, but not repeating, the past; so in the spiritual order, Christ had done with His public ministration to the world. When He rose, He gathered round about Him those whom He had associated with Him in the formation of His new kingdom and who were to be partakers of His Resurrection Life. The point is, He did not come back to His old life, but passed through death, and if we may use the expression, came out on the other side of it.

III. Consider how He did this. First, our Lord,

by His own action, separates His Body and Soul. He had said, "I have power to lay down My life," and He did so. He deliberately separated His Soul from His Body. But neither Body nor Soul was separated from His Deity.

A useful illustration is that Christ's Body and Soul were like a soldier's sword and sheath hanging at the soldier's side. The soldier draws his sword, and holds it in his hand. The sheath remains united to his person. In like manner, while our Lord's Soul and Body were separated, they continued to be united to His Divine Nature. "When," says Hooker, "His soul forsook the tabernacle of His body, His Deity forsook neither body nor soul." Thus His Body, while in the tomb, being united to Deity, was in the tomb a living thing. It was not dead, in the sense our bodies are dead. Our bodies are dead because separated from the soul, which is their vital principle. But Christ's Body, being united with His divine nature, was an indestructibly living thing, and could not see corruption.

When His soul came back from Hades, and was united to His body, He rose. During His former condition, His Body had preternatural powers. He could walk on the water. He could be transfigured. He could disappear at will. He seemingly restrained the exercise of such powers. However, be this as it may, when He rose His Body was either free from its former limiting conditions, or endowed with new powers. It was agile, subtle, luminous. We call it a spiritual body because, though the same

Body as was laid in the tomb, the Body did not control the spirit as it formerly did, but the Body obeyed the spirit. It could go from place to place at its own will. He could pass through the grave-clothes which had been wrapped around Him, and were found fallen down flat. So, likewise, He passed through the sides of the rocky tomb. The stone was rolled away by an angel for the admission of His disciples. His Body passed through the closed doors. It vanished at Emmaus at the breaking of the Bread. A further glory awaited it, as we learn from St. John. We thus believe in the identity of our Lord's Risen with His Crucified Body, though the process of its glorification had begun.

IV. Our new life depends upon His. Our souls, immortal by their nature, receive from Him the further gift of eternal life. A union by grace is begun here with Him, which terminates for the faithful in a union with God in Christ in glory. As His soul enjoyed, by virtue of its union with Deity, the Beatific Vision, so Christians are at last to attain to this vision, through union with Him. This new and special union is the source of our permanence in that state of blessedness.

But as Christ redeemed both body and soul, our bodies will share in that future glory. We are told that Christ "will change our vile body," i.e., the body of our humiliation, "and make it like unto His own glorious Body." It is therefore necessary first that our body, when separated from the soul or its life principle, should see corruption, which

His Body, being united to Deity, could not. It is necessary that we should put off the present body, derived from the first Adam, in order to be clothed upon with a body derived from Christ. These two principles of decay and renewal are to be seen in the natural order. Our bodies are perpetually decaying, and continually being resuscitated by the reception of new particles of matter by way of food. This aids us to understand our resurrection. First there must be a dissolution of the body. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Then it is clothed upon by Christ's body. "Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." The fathers thus called the Eucharist "the resurrection food."

The source of our risen body is thus to be found in our Lord's Risen Body. In His likeness we are to be transformed. When and how, is not fully or specifically revealed. We may believe it is a process begun now through the reception of the Blessed Sacrament. It may be complete in a fuller condition at our Lord's second coming. All that is of faith is that from our union with the humanity of Christ our bodies along with our souls, redeemed by Him, will attain to a union with God, which we now know by faith, in glory.

There are those who hold that the same particles of matter which compose our bodies at the time of our death will be summoned by Almighty power together and so form our resurrection body. But this

would not give us bodies fitted for a heavenly state, or like unto the glorious body of our Blessed Lord. We shall, by the possession of bodies, though glorified, be able to recognize one another, as the Apostles did the risen Christ, while we participate in joys beyond all that we can now conceive.

To the Editor of The Southern Churchman:

I must send you my Christmas greetings and thanks for your able defense of the faith in the matter of Christ's Virgin Birth. God bless the *Southern Churchman*.

Living in Boston as I did for many years, I came much in contact with the Broads and their school of thought. They do not believe in the "historical" Christ, but in the "essential" Christ, which is a being of their own construction. The miracles of our Lord are explained after this fashion: Christ did not walk on the water. There was a shallow where He walked. Peter got into deep water and our Lord pulled him out. Our Lord did not multiply the loaves. All the people had brought some food with them. But they were ashamed to bring it out. Our Lord began by bringing out what He and the Apostles had, and thus shamed or encouraged the multitude to do likewise. They did this, so there was enough to go round. These Broad Churchmen are not sound on the deity of Christ, and reject as unessential or unproven His Virgin Birth and the resurrection of his crucified body. To them the sacrifice on Calvary has lost its vicarious, atoning character.

The Broads have succeeded in capturing a large number of the wealthy parishes in the East, and as their system is in accord with the worldly and unbelieving spirit of the age, it is popular with the laity. A number of the clergy, who inherited the old-fashioned High Churchmanship of a past generation, have also sunk down into its rationalizing Churchmanship.

I venture to suggest one possible solution to this. In my younger days, the theological battle waxed sore over the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The High Churchmen made it the basis of every sermon, just as the old Evangelicals did the atonement. With the High Churchmen baptismal regeneration was the core and apparent consummation of the Gospel system. It led many to this: that they practically omitted the need of conversion. They largely rejected the necessity of being convicted of sin, and the work of the Spirit, and of salvation by Christ's cross and passion, and of a conscious acceptance by Him. Indeed, in cases, they rejected it as Methodism. I remember being taken to task for preaching it.

But baptism, without a vitalized union with Christ, could not save men. Consequently their own spiritual life and perceptions declined. In the developments that succeeded, they easily fell under the influence of the new rationalizing, easy-going, and popular Broad Church system.

I have always thought that the old Evangelicals and the conservative High Churchmen were agreed

in essentials more than they realized. The one is drawn more to the subjective, the other to the objective, side of the Gospel revelation. They are, however, reconcilable. There are, it is true, extremists on either wing. You will, perhaps, count me as one. I extend, however, my Christian love to all the brethren loyal in heart to the Prayer Book, and apologize to any who have been offended by me. We Churchmen are in the presence of a great struggle with radical unbelief within our own body. The Church has been slumbering and is just awakening to hear the cry, "The Philistines are upon thee." Let us sink our minor differences and unite in defense of Evangelical truth and Church Order.

For the protection of our beloved Church, would it not be well for the next General Convention to pass a Canon placing all our theological seminaries (save the General) so under the supervision of the Bishops of their departments, as to give them the power of deciding what text-books should be used, and have a general oversight of the teaching, and possibly the confirmation of the election of professors?

C. C. Fond du Lac.

Bishop's House, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin,
April 10, 1906.

ADDRESSES TO THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

THE FEAST OF CORPUS CHRISTI AND THE REAL PRESENCE

To the Clergy and Members of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament:

NECESSARILY obliged to be absent, I can but send you, dear brethren, my greeting and Episcopal benediction.

Allow me to say a few words about our Name and Feast day, and the objects of our Confraternity.

About our name. We are known as the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament." You have been blamed, and sometimes by persons in authority, for speaking of the Holy Eucharist as the "Blessed" Sacrament. Why, it has been asked, should it be called the "Blessed" Sacrament, any more than we should call baptism "holy" baptism? Your answer is, because your good spiritual mother, the Anglican Communion, in the book of Common Prayer, has taught you so to do. In the form given there for the consecration of a Church, the Bishop is, by the Rubric, bidden thus to pray:

"Grant, O Lord, that whoever in this place shall receive the *Blessed* Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

In using this title then, and teaching others so to do, we are acting as loyal sons of our mother, and are repeating the words she has bidden us to use.

Again, you have been criticized and blamed for keeping your Annual Conference on the first Thursday after Trinity Sunday, which is commonly known as the Feast of Corpus Christi. Are you not disloyal to the Anglican Church, it is asked, in thus selecting a Feast day which is of medieval origin and connected with a legendary miracle of questionable value? No, our reply must again be, We are not disloyal or acting in any spirit of self-will. The Anglican Church our spiritual mother has, by the authorized legal calendars, put forth since the Reformation, yearly up to the year 1830, with the *imprimatur* of successive Archbishops of Canterbury, observed this day. With the origin of the Feast we are not concerned, but whatever else may be said about it, we cannot be called disloyal in recognizing the day in company with the noble line of Canterbury's Archbishops, in post-Reformation times.

Surely we may ask our friends why should not some day be kept in honor of such a gift? If it be said that the Feast days observed in our Prayer Book are kept in honor of our Lord or His Blessed Mother, or of His Apostles, it is to be noted that there is one very marked exception to this general rule. On the last Thursday in November we keep a day sanctioned by the Church in Thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth. If we are to keep a day in Thanksgiving for the daily bread which supports

our bodies, is it not more fitting we should keep a day in Thanksgiving for the gift of the true bread from Heaven, which is the spiritual food of our souls? And if it is no objection that Thanksgiving day was started, not by the Church but originated with the Puritans and in opposition to the Church's festivals, certainly it is no objection to keeping the Feast of Corpus Christi that it had its genesis in another branch of the Church, and may be connected with doctrines with which we do not agree. No one familiar with the structure of the Church year but can see the appropriateness of this well-chosen time for our yearly Conference. For the Christian year is divided, as you well know, into two great parts, the one beginning with Advent and Christmas, the coming and birth of Christ; the other beginning with Whitsunday, the birthday of the Church.

As around the birthday of Christ there are three feast days, marking different degrees of saintliness of those who follow Christ, so the great festival after the birthday of the Church and the revelation of the Triune Name is that of Corpus Christi; the Feast which tells of Christ's abiding presence in His Church, and of that wondrous gift by which the Church offers her perfect worship, and is perfected in her union with her Lord. So much for the day on which we keep our festival.

Pardon me if I add a few words on a most familiar theme — the object of the Confraternity. In making better understood the double nature of the

Blessed Sacrament as a Sacrifice, and as a Communion, you are engaged in a most blessed work. No Church reform ever has succeeded which was purely an intellectual one. The onward movement needs a great devotion. If you desire to extend the Catholic faith and build up your people in sanctity, you must strive to kindle within them an enthusiastic devotion to our Lord and King, present in the Blessed Sacrament and leading his people on to victory.

In aiding persons to receive and accept the truth of the Real objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, which the Catholic Church has always held from the beginning, it is well to begin with what persons, if they have any doubts, already know. Begin with the truth recognized by Churchmen of all schools — "that where two or three are gathered together there Christ is in the midst of them." He is there, because at His Ascension He did not leave the Church and send (according to popular error) the Holy Spirit to take His place. We know this from His own statements, for no more clearly did He say, "I will send you the Comforter," than He said, "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you. I will be with you till the end of the world." "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, I will be in the midst of them."

The Ascension of Christ emancipated His body from the controlling conditions of time and space, and it became so united to the Divine Nature as that He could at His will and pleasure make it mani-

fest in any portion of the spiritual organism, which is His body, the Church.

An interesting instance of this is given us in the New Testament, for while St. Stephen sees our Lord after His ascension standing at the right hand of God, nevertheless our Lord appears in the roadway to Saul going to Damascus. So near was our Lord to His future Apostle that his attendants heard that words were being spoken, but only St. Paul, on account of his nearness to our Lord, clearly heard the words themselves. Let us plainly teach this first fundamental truth.

Christ ascended becomes the Head and Center of spiritual organism, which is His Church; and the Holy Ghost does not come to take the place of an absent Christ, but to make Christ's presence effective in any part of His mystical body according to His will and ordained agencies.

One special agency we know to be the Blessed Sacrament. So as Christ was present in the upper chamber when He took the bread and said, "This is my Body," and of the cup, "This is my Blood," so He, abiding in the Church now though unseen, by His authorized agents gathers the elements into union with Himself, and by the special power of the Holy Ghost they become what His Word declares them to be. You, dear brethren, well understand this truth.

Let us not try to explain this mystery. Let us teach it simply in the language of Holy Scripture. Let us try and make our people realize the value of

the great Gospel act of worshiping in the offering of this spiritual sacrifice. Let us strive to make men come better prepared and with more devotion and childlike faith to receive Christ's Body and Blood, and to worship the Person of their adorable Lord.

I would gladly say somewhat more. But I have written what I have rather to show that I have you in my heart, and bid you to take courage and, in God's Name, press forward this work.

Yours sincerely in Our Blessed Lord,

CHARLES C. GRAFTON,

Superior General, C. B. S.

ANNUAL ADDRESS
(1900)

MY DEAR BRETHREN OF THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT:

UNABLE to be present with you, I send you my greetings in the Lord and my benediction. The Confraternity is steadily growing and its principles far more so. Many who have not enrolled themselves as members are in hearty sympathy with our objects. A better understanding of the doctrine of the Real Presence is gradually pervading our Communion. More reverence, than formerly marked the celebration of the Sacrament, is everywhere to be observed. The good the Confraternity is doing cannot be tabulated or measured by mere outward signs. In our own Diocese there is not a Priest who has not a weekly Celebration, and there are now

twelve daily Eucharists offered. Details of ritual, which were once regarded with suspicion, and thought to be symbolical of erroneous doctrines, are quietly being established and no longer regarded as party badges or denoting extreme men.

One matter, that of Communion of the sick, has much exercised our English brethren. But under the allowed sanction, in cases of necessity, given by our House of Bishops the foreign opinion is not likely to disturb us.

Yet it may not be unprofitable to review some of the arguments given against the primitive Church custom of carrying the Sacrament to the sick. If there is a class of communicants who are more entitled than others to a merciful consideration, it is our Lord's suffering and dying children. Modern medical science, speaking by a petition of upwards of a thousand physicians, has asked, in the interest of humanity, that the Anglican Priest should minister the Sacrament to the sick in the same simple manner as is done by the Roman Clergy. It is a privilege granted to our laity that, when they can bear it, the celebration may take place in their own houses. It is a right they may also demand, that if not so able, nevertheless they shall not depart without the comfort of receiving the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of their Lord. How any can have the heart to refuse it, we cannot comprehend. But as there were those who complained of our Lord because He healed on the Sabbath Day, so there are those amongst us who would deprive God's children of the

Bread of Life rather than let mercy interpret a Rubric contrary to their preconceived opinion.

1. The first argument against this ancient blessed practice may be called the English argument. The English Clergy, it seems, make a declaration that "In public prayer and administration of the Sacraments they will use the form in said book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." The argument of the Archbishops is this: "Reservation is not found in the Book of Common Prayer and therefore the administration of the Holy Communion by reservation is no part of the form contained in it."

To this we reply by denying the major premise. The Archbishop of Canterbury states it thus: "We deny that reservation *in any sense* whatever is part of the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. Now we admit that the word "reservation" is not to be found in the form prescribed. But we assert that Reservation of the Sacrament is ordered by the form and is a necessary part of it. In the Roman rite, after the Communion of the Priest and people, the Sacred Elements are consumed. In the Book of Common Prayer they are not so ordered to be consumed. The Priest is commanded to reserve them. He must reserve them until after the Blessing. They are reserved for no purpose of communicating. But they are ordered to be reserved and the people are wont to make their thanksgiving in the presence of the Reserved Sacrament. In contradiction therefore to the statement that "Reser-

vation *in any sense whatever* is not part of our rite," we have proved that it is an ordered part of our form.

Again, the Archbishop of York argues that the "administration of the Communion by reservation is no part of the Book of Common Prayer and is therefore forbidden." Now we grant "that administration of the Holy Communion by reservation" is no part of the Prayer Book.

Here we admit the major premise. We agree in holding that the reformers never were so foolish as to suppose such a thing possible. How can any one "administer the Holy Communion *by reservation*"? The Prayer Book tells the Priest to communicate the people by giving the Sacrament into their hands, not by reserving it. No Priest in England ever attempted such a remarkable feat as that condemned by the Archbishop, of "administering by reservation." What is meant, it might be said, is that the Prayer Book does not allow of communicating with the Reserved Sacrament. But taken this way we must reply, that is just what the Prayer Book compels the Priests to do. What does the Priest do when he administers to the second railful of Communicants, but communicate them with the Sacrament that has been reserved after the first railful has communicated? Reservation, therefore, as a condition precedent of communicating is not wrong or forbidden.

But lastly, to the argument based on the declaration, we reply further that the declaration does not apply to private Communions. It has nothing to

do with the case before us. For it will be noticed that the declaration reads, "In *public* prayer and administration of the Sacraments they will use the form in said book prescribed." The word "public" refers both to prayer and the administration of the Sacraments. This is clear from two reasons. If by "public prayer" the offices of Matins and Evensong alone were meant, then those words would more properly have been used, and the word "public" omitted. Again if both public and private administration of the Sacraments were intended, then the promise would properly have been to use the *forms* provided. The declaration does not say forms, but only form, and so refers to the one form given for the "Administration of the Lord's Supper," and that is the public one. For again it must be noted that it is only the public service in Church that is called "The Administration of the Lord's Supper." The private house service is called "The Communion of the Sick." So much for the English argument. We Americans are not bound by any such declaration and may well dismiss the argument as practically worthless.

2. The next objection made to this loving act of mercy in carrying the Sacrament to those sick and dying ones, who either are so feeble or in such crowded hospitals as to prevent a celebration at their bedside, is that it is contrary to the XXVIII Article. This may be called the argument of Theological Ignorance. The Article says, "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance

reserved, carried about," etc. Whoever claimed that Christ so ordered? But is it wrong to do things which have not been ordered by Christ? Is it wrong to bless the water to be used in Baptism? It may be wrong to use a Sacrament to ends for which it was not designed. It is not wrong to do things which are not contrary to the purposes of Christ in ordaining it. In some degree the Sacrament must be reserved, lifted up, carried about at every administration. It must be lifted up, when the Priest takes the paten and chalice in his hands. It must be carried about to the Communicants at the rail, and is often taken to the pews when administered to the lame and paralyzed. It must be reserved from one railful to the next, and at the end after all have communicated it must be reserved that the faithful may sing the Gloria Excelsis in Its presence. Such a reserving and carrying about is in accord with the Divine purpose of feeding the faithful with the Bread of Life. Does it make it wrong if instead of giving It to the sick in a pew, we give It to one in the vestry room where the sick person may be lying on a couch? Is it wrong to carry It into a hospital ward if the celebration takes place in a hospital chapel, or carry It to the next house? Does a little longer reservation, or a few more steps, make this act of mercy a sin? Can the article be tortured into condemning it? So far as our own Church law is concerned one fact should forever settle this contention. In the Nonjurors' Scotch Prayer Book which is allowed to be used at this day in Scotland, there

are the same Articles with the XXVIII as we have it, and yet there are in the Communion office and the visitation of the sick Rubrics explicitly providing for and directing the Reservation for the sick. With this fact before us, whatever else may be said, it cannot with any theological honesty be urged that the carrying of the Sacrament to the sick is contrary to our Article. We may therefore dismiss this argument, the compound of ignorance and prejudice, as worthless.

3. The third argument against the sick and dying man's privilege is that the Prayer Book contains a form of celebrating the Communion in the sick man's home. But if he be too weak for it, or in too indigent circumstances to have the Communion in that way, then it is claimed he must die without it. This may be called the inconsequential argument. The argument is because one form is provided, all others are excluded. This is not the law of the case. No one can be condemned as a criminal upon such a line of argument. Because the American Church has provided a form of family prayer it does not follow that every layman is bound to use it and no other; or is bound to use any form of family worship. The Church has provided a form of visitation of the sick: it does not follow that the Priest is bound to use this form alone or always to conform himself to it. In his private ministration the Priest possesses a liberty in the exercise of his office of ministering to souls. He always had the right to carry the Blessed Sacrament to the sick members

of his flock. Is it not a right inherent in his office? The Church might provide a service for it or not. If it had provided one and then omitted it, the omission would not debar him of his right. It would not prevent him in providing for the laity their Christian privilege. Such an interpretation would not only be against the principles of criminal law, but those of public policy and the Church's good.

But does the office for the Communion of the sick forbid celebrations elsewhere and the bringing the Sacrament thus consecrated to the sick man? Certainly it does not. The sick man is to give notice that he is desirous — not of having a *Celebration* in his presence — but that he is desirous to receive the *Communion in his house.* There is nothing in the Rubric for the Communion of the sick to prevent the Priest from celebrating in another room in the house and then bringing the Sacrament from it to the sick man. There would then be the necessity of lifting up the Sacrament and of the reservation of the Sacrament for the sick man's benefit, as he is to receive last.

When myself a chaplain at the Church Home and Infirmary, Baltimore, I have celebrated in the hospital chapel and carried the Sacrament to the sick in another part of the building. This I did with the knowledge and consent of the late Bishop Whittingham.

The office of Communion for the sick provides, however, for other ways of communicating him. First, as we have seen, he may consecrate in another

room, or secondly, in the American Book, the Priest may consecrate in the sick man's presence and then greatly reduce the service. He may say only "the confession and absolution; the Consecration; the Communion; the Lord's Prayer; the Blessing." But then there is another, a third form. The Priest may formally "visit" the sick man and begin by dealing with his soul, as in the visitation office. If so, the Rubric tells him he may cut off the visitation at the psalm and "go straight," not to the *Celebration* of the Holy Communion as in the first given case, or to a shortened form of it, including the Consecration as in the second, but go straight to *Communion*. Now the word "Communion" used by itself in the Prayer Book means the act of receiving. This is the meaning in the previous Rubric of the office. Now words in the same law must mean the same thing. He cannot, however, "go straight to the Communion" unless he has the Sacrament with him. So it is by no means so clear but that this office provides for Reservation. Many persons interpret the Prayer Book as Protestants interpret the Bible, without knowing there is the Holy Catholic Church behind it. The writers of the Rubric may not have intended Reservation, but the Holy Ghost guiding them, they framed a Rubric that allows of it.

This way of communicating the sick has been a recognized, allowable practice in our Church. There have been many notable instances of it in our country and England. Many years ago I was a volunteer

chaplain in a London Cholera Hospital. Bishop Tait, afterward the Archbishop of Canterbury, gave to me and Father O'Neil permission to carry the Blessed Sacrament to the sick in Shoreditch. So the argument that because an office has been provided, no other mode of administering is allowable, may be put aside as inconclusive. It belongs to the March Hare and Hatter class of argumentation in the wonderland of nonsense.

4. The last argument the friends who oppose us cling to, is the post Communion Rubric. It declares, in the American form, that if any of the consecrated bread and wine remain after the Communion, it shall not be carried out of the Church; but the minister and other Communicants shall immediately after the blessing reverently eat and drink the same. This is the enemy's stronghold. He is never tired of repeating it over and over again, with Hebrew pertinacity. It is not the English argument, for over there it seems to be given up. It is not the argument of ignorance or inconclusiveness. For many reasons it is best known as the Shylock argument. It is the argument of cruelty that heeds no cry for mercy in its persistent demand for its bond and the letter of the law.

But let us look at it. In the first place, with the private intentions of the framers of it or any other part of the Prayer Book, we have nothing to do. We are not looking at the matter as historians, but as jurists. As jurists we know the intention must be gathered from the law itself. We are meeting

Shylock's cry for the law, by the law. Now the Rubric only bids the Priest consume what remains. The Priest may therefore after consecrating put aside what he needs for the sick and then, after the Blessing, consume what remains from the Communion of the people. The American Prayer Book has made this quite clear. In the Prayer of Consecration, we pray that "we and *all others* who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the Body and Blood of Christ." Bishop Seabury probably took this form from the Scotch Liturgy which allowed of reservation. So we pray not for ourselves alone, who are present, but for others, viz., the absent sick who of this same Communion shall be partakers. And in order to make the post-Communion Rubric clearly agree with this change, certain words were inserted which are not in the English Rubric. The latter requires that the Priest consume what "remains." But in the American Rubric the words "after the Communion" are inserted. We are required to consume, not all of what remains at the end of the service, but only that portion which remains "*after the Communion*" of the people. Now the Communion is something, as we learn from the Rubric, in the Ordering of a Priest, "done" and finished *before the Blessing*. So that our Rubric by requiring that only to be consumed which remains "*after the Communion*," implies that for those absent ones for whom we prayed some of the Sacred Elements *would* be reserved. So the Rubric does not forbid Reservation, but implies

it. We have called this objection the Shylock argument, because just as that hard-hearted old Jewish miser was defeated by the very law to which he appealed, so it happens here. God has "overruled his servants" so that the Church's office commands Reservation. Her Liturgy may properly be called the Liturgy of Reservation, and the Evil One cannot overthrow it.

Yet it is not improbable, dear Brothers, that some of us may have to suffer ere the truth is triumphant. We must not put our trust in man or princes. Since the days of Pilate and Caiaphas, the world's courts and the ecclesiastical courts have often taken the side of the great adversary. We must offer the Sacrifice and put our trust in the Lord. In patience and confidence possess ye your souls. Tarry thou the Lord's leisure and let Him bring it to pass.

May He bless you and have you in His keeping in the bond of the Catholic Faith and the Sacrament of His love.

CHARLES C. GRAFTON,
Superior General, C. B. S.

AN ADDRESS
(1902)

DEAR BRETHREN OF THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT:

RECEIVE our greetings in the Lord and the assurance of our prayers for your temporal and spiritual welfare, and for the fullest Blessings of his grace. May the blessed work in which you are

engaged of making known the Catholic Faith, and especially all that appertains to the Blessed Sacrament, be forwarded with increasing zeal and with the coöperating aid of the Holy Spirit.

Your Council has asked me to address you on the exigencies of our time, our opportunities and the proposed plans for extending our Confraternity's influence.

Concerning our time, we all, dear brethren, feel that the Christian army is being assaulted on both wings, by materialism, science, worldliness, the time-spirit and unbelief on the one side; and on the other by anti-Christian supernaturalism, and superstition and other malefic forces of the great enemy.

The former of these opponents, basing itself solely on observation and experiment, questions the existence of spirit; the latter denies the existence of matter.

The issues raised by each are not merely doctrinal, philosophical, or academical, but are moral, affecting conduct and character.

Science, that twenty years ago, as voiced by Huxley, admitted the moral code to be man's priceless treasure and sought "to make room for Christian ethics in the framework of naturalistic speculation has changed its attitude. The attempt is being made now to get rid of morals as in themselves pernicious and hostile to progress. On the one hand, mercy, the preservation of the weak, charity, philanthropy, must go as being treason to the best interests of the race. On the other hand, temperance,

chastity, self-denial, all these under the suspect name of asceticism, are to be driven out as priest-forged fetters of the individual." [1] Likewise the deniers of matter, combining Indian Buddhist Pantheism with some old Gnostic notions, reject personality and so a personal God, and teach the non-existence of sin and guilt. You know well these two forms of the latter day attacks on the Christian Faith.

But it is within the Christian fold we must note the greatest dangers. Nothing good can be crushed by antagonistic external forces if it is united within. Alas! it is not so with Christianity. Within the sphere of Christianity there is a divided Church and a sect spirit energetically powerful in chrystalizing those divisions. It may be shown that the Papal system was largely developed by aid of the Forged Decretals, but the arch erected over the framework stands when its support has been destroyed. It may be shown that Wesley never intended his followers to leave the Church and never consecrated Bishops, but that great powerful Methodist organization is unaffected by any exposition of its origin. In the pride of success the separated religious bodies do not feel the need of outward union, and care little for appeals to Scripture or history. The gates of hell have not prevailed against the Church, but they have torn the Church apart. The prophecy has come to pass. All His bones are out of joint. The outer robe of Christ's Body is rent. The net is broken. Within the city there are hostile camps.

[1] Science and Faith, by the Rev. P. N. Waggett, S. S. J. E.

We find it to be so in some degree within our own communion. The objective and subjective sides of the Gospel are not held in complete balance by all, and so we have High and Low Churchmen. The human and the divine elements gain ascendency in different proportions in individuals, and we have the rationalistic broad Churchman and the authority-loving conservative.

It is not to be altogether regretted that it is so. All within the fold are preserved in the enfolding. But all schools must learn from each other and all must hold their apprehension of the Faith in charity. We see the great Cathedral of truth from different angles, and no one sees it all. The dangerous men are those who are extreme in one direction only, and do not advance in all directions to the full circumference of the faith.

Each school has its extremists and its special danger. We know and would acknowledge our own mistakes.

There are others who rejecting authority would determine the contents of revealed religion solely by the clash of intellectual effort; who reject in the Old and New Testament, where possible, the element of the supernatural; who would substitute an "essential" for the historical Christ; who regard the Virgin birth as unessential, and the Resurrection Body of the Lord as not identical with that laid in the tomb, and who disbelieve in the representative efficacy of Christ's atonement. With such the Church is but a human society evolved by natural causes, and one

ministry as valid as another, and the sacraments not efficacious signs and instruments of grace, but like in kind to Jewish ordinances. The more peculiar feature of this system is that it emphasizes character and makes its formation the chief object and glory of its preaching. Yet the fact is that its type of character is rather that of the higher type of cultivated paganism, with its beauty, endurance, moral virtues, patriotism and goodness, than of the new man created in Christ Jesus by the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of Sacramental Grace, and recognized by the Church in the lives of her canonized Saints.

This form of religion as it makes less demand on faith, and for self-sacrifice, is naturally the most popular, and has on its side much intellectual cleverness and the wealth and support of the worldly. It holds largely in our communion the purse strings, and sits in the chief places of power and rule.

While we may thus see in part some of the forces antagonistic, we may also discern in some measure how God is overruling all to good.

Consider the great discovery of Evolution, which like that of the Copernican system, so far from contradicting is being found to be confirmatory of the Christian creed. It declares the unity of nature and the presence in it of an Infinite and Eternal Energy which is recognized to be intelligent because it expresses itself in an intelligent way. As an endless chain of material causation is unthinkable, an Eternal Energy, which is necessarily a self-starting

one and without an antecedent, must obviously be a Will. So God and Man are alike demonstrated facts, and the origin of religion is seen to be the correspondence of man to his environment, which is God.

As the universe would be unthinkable were there not a God behind it, so it would be immoral if He did not make a Revelation of Himself. Since, however, the revelation made through nature knows nothing of forgiveness for violated law, a further revelation is necessary if man is to attain the deliverance he finds he needs. This Revelation which is both multiform in character and progressive in action is completed in the Saviour Christ. By the Sacrifice of Himself He effects our deliverance. Evolution as now understood bears witness to this great Gospel principle of sacrifice. For it takes cognizance not only of past and present, but by consideration of the future enters into all development. Thus the Christian law of sacrifice of the present and for others' welfare is seen to be the law of success for nations and the elevation of man. The seed must fall into the ground and die to bring forth fruit. Christ must be lifted up to draw all men unto Him. Now, as before, both philosophy and science are proving the allies of Christian faith. It is not the first time, as the Bishop of Derry said, that "the battle-guns which one generation has turned upon the lines of the army of Christ have been captured and melted into church bells" to ring out pæans of victory for the next.

While the sects are holding together, yet the theology on which they were based is being undermined. Their basic principle, "the Bible and the Bible only," has failed them. Their teachers must either part more and more with their own accredited formulas and the ancient Gospel, and become practically Unitarian, or recognize the Apostolic Catholic Church as the organism in which Christ dwells and the keeper and guardian of the Faith. If our Church was in action what she is in her Prayer Book; if she, instinct with the holy fire of her Pentecostal origin, presented herself in love and spiritual power as the American Catholic Church, what might she not do?

Broad Churchmanship, while financially strong and popular, is too weak in its theology and spiritual culture to satisfy the devout and better instructed Churchman. It is weak in its theology because, while it has grasped the old Catholic truth of God's immanence in Nature, it has not as yet realized the new creation and the immanence in it of its Head, the God-Man, Christ Jesus.

There are, in fact, two worlds—an outer and an inner one,—a material and a spiritual one. One is of temporary duration, the other is for eternity. In the one God is immanent and upholds all by His power. "In Him we live and move and have our being." Of the other, Jesus Christ, the God-Man, is the Head and upholds all by His grace. Each world has its own laws. What are natural occurrences in the spiritual organism, are called miracles in the material world.

In the natural order, man learns by observation and experiment and the use of his imagination and reason. In the spiritual kingdom, of which Christ is the Sun and the Holy Ghost, the life-giving Atmosphere, man, enfranchised from the limitations of reason and illuminated by the Holy Spirit, sees. In the one order, man arrives by reason at different degrees of probability and believes; in the other, to certainty and knows. In the one order, hypothesis is in some cases demonstrated by experiment and man's reason is convincingly assured. Likewise in the other, knowledge is verified by experiment and further it is possessed. By action on the truth seen, the spiritual man is united to the Truth and it enters into him and transforms him and is made his own. In each kingdom God bestows His gifts through ordained media. In the one, sustaining physical life by foods which communicate His power. In the new creation, sustaining its members by sacraments which communicate His grace. His power in the natural order comes from His Godhead, and so we are, as St. Paul says, "His offspring." His grace in the new Kingdom or mystical body comes from the Humanity of the Incarnate God and we are made members of Christ. Baptism proclaims not our natural relation to God but conveys something we had not before. Being incorporated into Christ, His life and death and merits are ours and we are saved by Him. We are in Him and also He is in us. Christ entering into us we are transformed by His virtues and life. Christ in us is the hope of glory.

The new world is identical with the Holy Catholic Church.

Only by incorporation into Christ are we saved, and there is salvation in no other way. For there are three ways of union with God, viz., by nature, and grace, and glory. In that final union with God in glory, eternal happiness will be eternally secured to those who attain to it. They will be eternally happy, because eternally sinless, for sin will then by them be impossible. God will finally triumph over all evil and sin, because those who miss that end can no longer sin. For while they cannot separate themselves from the power of God, alas, man can do so from His grace. The second period in creation will then be over and the day of probation closed. Grace being withdrawn, the estate of the lost is eternally fixed, because since apart from grace they cannot sin, without it neither can they repent. It is our Lord who has declared this Eternal Life and the possibility of its everlasting loss. In the words of the Apostle Paul, "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is Eternal Life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Thus much concerning the issues of the day and the solemn message we have to announce to the world. To the Church at large our position as Catholic Churchmen is a peculiar one, and fraught with tremendous possibilities. But to do that duty we must concentrate our efforts on our own Communion. By the good providence of God, the American Church has a singular power beyond that

of its numbers or wealth. We have eighty (80) or more Bishops out of the two hundred and fifty (250), while we are but five thousand (5000) clergy out of some forty thousand (40,000). We are free in the development of our Liturgy and the election of our Bishops, and are not trammeled by state laws. If we could but make this portion of the Anglican communion really and unitedly Catholic, we should lift the whole body to a higher level and powerfully aid the readjustment of the relations of England's Church and State. We must strive to Catholicize, in the best sense, this Church of ours and make her true to her heritage and Prayer Book, as the way to make her a City of Refuge for the distressed in mind, and a center of unity to the separated churches.

You have long known and must feel, dear brethren, that nothing will so tend to the immediate result we seek in our own American Catholic Church as a general belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, and the making it the chief act of our Sunday worship.

It was for this purpose that we put forth and sent you the Tract on "the Holy Eucharist in the New Testament." Not that we thought you or your people needed instruction as from us, but so that you and they might be aided in becoming missionaries to others. For we must not be content with reaching our own people, but reach out beyond our parishes. We must generously sow the seed broadcast with prayer to God for the increase. We

must not be so wrapt up in our own local work as not to be in heartbeat and hand-help of the general cause.

If fifty thousand copies of this tract could be placed, by donation, in the hands of the vestrymen and other laymen, what a difference might be made in the tone of our Diocesan Conventions. We must imitate the zeal and wisdom of the statesmen who wish to mold public opinion and generously use the press. Every member of the Confraternity should rouse himself to do missionary work in propagating the Faith. Can we do better work for Christ's sake? Christ came to send fire on the earth and a fire into the hearts of his people. By all you have known and experienced of the Love and Power in that Great Wonder of Love and Blessing, make known Its Truth. Take your General's motto for your own: "Press on the Kingdom."

It is also a matter of practical wisdom that we act together and take an active interest in increasing our numbers. We do not value the Confraternity as we ought. The clergy are apt to think of it as one more parochial organization. It is to them only like another guild. It adds something to parochial machinery, but it is only one of many interests of a like kind. It is something far higher and more potent. It not only develops, as nothing else can, the spiritual life of our people, it not only binds together Catholics throughout the Church in a living bond of daily common intercession, it not only brings down blessings on parishes and indi-

viduals, but it more than anything else strengthens the Catholic cause.

You are well aware how important the issues are that will be presented at the next General Convention. There will come, for perhaps gain or final loss, the question of the Church's name. Is she to be longer hampered by wearing the old sect name she now bears? It may have served well at the beginning of our career in this country. But how things have changed! We do not complain of the term Protestant in its old sense of one who utters a protest but will not be a seceder. But it means something different now. It identifies us with every form of modern error. It denies to the popular ear our rightful heritage. It gives to Rome a tremendous advantage.

You know that the question of divorce will again be presented. Which side is going to triumph? Shall Christian marriage be declared by its indissolubility a witness, as the word of God says, to the indissolubility of Christ's union with His Church, or shall sensuality and worldiness and ignorance triumph?

Shall our Missionary system be strengthened by the gathering of groups of Dioceses together as Provinces, our elections to our Episcopate be better safeguarded thereby, our educational and charitable and theological institutions be more carefully developed and fostered, an appellate judicial system be provided, or shall we go on in the old way, marking time and missing the day of our opportunities?

These and many other issues are at stake. You have a very deep interest in all of them. Do you want to know one way of securing the best results? Try and get some brother priest to join the Confraternity. You will increase its power of intercession. More than that, what a difference it would make if your Superior General could speak as representing a body of eight hundred or a thousand priests. What a difference if he had such a body of united and loyal hearts behind him. It is by union the world carries its great measures. It is only by like means we can perform our duty to the faith we have received, and our mission to the Church.

Your Council has proposed, for the further development of the Confraternity, a provincial system with some nineteen districts, with a Director at the head of each. Of this you have received a circular from the Reverend, the Secretary General. It has my entire approval, and will, I believe, tend greatly to the Confraternity's efficiency. Do forward it and make it a success.

Let me ask you to make known this letter to those in your ward and to others. Also to make the growth of the Confraternity a special matter of intercession. Preach about it. Let us see if we cannot double our numbers. Where you can do so, begin or revive the daily Eucharist. It is to united prayer and the pleading of the Divine Sacrifice the victory is given. Not by learning or controversy, not by power or might, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts.

It was the wise saying, forty years ago, of a President of Harvard, and he a Unitarian, "We may have all the argument on our side and all the learning, and a full proportion of the integrity and honor; yet it will profit us nothing if we are suspected of being deficient in faith and piety, if we have not an unction from the Holy One. The bulk of the community are not looking round for the truest or the most consistent form of worship, but for that which will best satisfy their religious wants. Hence that sect will be almost sure to be in the ascendent which gives the most striking and unequivocal signs of seriousness and zeal, which loves the most, and prays the most and does the most good."[1]

Commending you to our Blessed Lord and to His Grace with all Blessing,

Lovingly yours in Him,
CHARLES C. GRAFTON,
Superior General, C. B. S.

May 1st, 1902.

THE CHURCH'S WORSHIP
(1903)

REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN OF THE CONFRATERNITY:

PEACE and grace be with you all. Met together in His Name and for His glory, may His Holy Spirit guide you in all your deliberations and make you of one mind and heart in His House, whose House builded together in the spirit you are.

It is a cause of regret that we cannot be with

[1] Religion not a Science but a want. Sermon by Dr. Walker.

you in your meeting to-day on this great festival, but we shall join with you in a solemn celebration of the Holy Mysteries at our Cathedral.

Where you are assembled we know they will be celebrated with all reverence and devotion and the seemly dignity that belongs to our inherited Catholic liturgy.

It belongs to your special calling as Priests of the Confraternity, and it is your high privilege, to restore in these lax days the decent order which the Reformers preserved for us in the Book of Common Prayer, but which had been obscured by Puritan opposition and neglect. Churchmen had become so accustomed to a Sunday service that relegated the Holy Eucharist to a subordinate position, and when celebrated so shorn of its traditional ceremonial that they hardly believed such was the mind of the reformed Church. The night was so long, and it was so long a time of darkness, "as if another night had fallen on the back of midnight," that men mistook the darkness for day. The Episcopal Church, it was said in the middle of the last century, has attained a stereotyped form of worship that cannot be altered. How slowly, how very slowly, the Church has been awakening to the light, you somewhat know. Through what trials and perils has she not passed! The waves at times seemed to engulf the ship. Timid and disheartened shipmen, "under color as though they would have cast anchors," were tempted to flee out of her. But God had spoken to the Anglican Church through His Saints, saying, "Fear not."

Through them the Church was called to a lightening of the ship by casting over her worldliness. A St. John the Baptist call to repentance and confession stirred the Church; the clergy began to recover the almost lost ideal of a priestly life. In the laity was aroused a missionary spirit, a life of deeper spirituality and more entire consecration. But the work has been a slow one, and is only beginning to be accomplished. Here in America, how imperfectly the doctrine of the Incarnation and its extension through the Sacraments is understood. As yet, the Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist is apprehended by comparatively few, and the Holy Sacrifice yet waits for restoration as the supreme act of our Sunday service. How have Christ's messengers been obliged to speak to dull ears and prejudiced minds and callous hearts. The Pharisee, self-satisfied with his Protestant inherited traditions, and the Sadducee, with his Rationalism, have not only rejected but sought to suppress the revival of Catholic truth and worship. Yet we have much to be thankful for. Like Paul in the shipwreck, we learned to take Bread and break it, and give thanks to God and be of good cheer. Every good cause must have its trials and its martyrs. Thank God its heroes and saints have not been wanting to the Catholic movement. It has slowly come to be better understood that the Church of God exists for a double purpose. It exists for the ingathering of souls into Christ, and so for their deliverance from the power of sin, and their salvation. It exists also for the

purpose of glorifying God by offering to Him a Holy worship. "The Church is not primarily an educational or philanthropic society, though both of these she must be, but a society which exists to worship God." She is a living, spiritual organism, in which the High Priest dwells, and of which Christ, the High Priest of humanity, is the Head, and through which redeemed creation offers up itself in self-renouncing oblation to the Most High God. "The Catholic Church is thus God's new creation; called into being and sanctified by the new inbreathing of the Spirit of Life, for the purpose of offering to God that in which the old creation failed, the free will offering of filial love."

You are well familiar with all the objections that ignorance and prejudice and party spirit hurl against you.

Men look upon your altars, adorned with lights and fragrant with incense, on the vestments of the priests, on the order and reverence of the ceremonial, and are wont to say it is a renewal of Judaism. "Did not Christ do away with all this form and ceremony, when He came preaching in His carpenter's dress and with naught but the canopy of heaven for His Temple, and wayside stone or rocking boat for His pulpit?" God, we know, gave His sanction to a service that was liturgical, ritualistic, ceremonial, choral, when He established the ancient order, and our Lord placed the seal of His sanction on it by His presence in the Temple. Moreover, He gave order for its continuance when He took St. John up

into Heaven, where he beheld the glory and splendor of that heavenly worship, where God is worshiped in spirit and in truth.

So, too, how often we hear it said that Catholic worship is based on heathen rites, and has borrowed from Paganism its ideas of priesthood, and sacrifice, and, in part, its ceremonial. Suppose this were true, what then? God has taught us through all nations. He has given us through Rome the idea of social order and law, and Greece is the first storehouse of philosophy, as the Hebrew race is of religion. Humanity is one. God speaks to us through it. The instinct that led the heathen world to worship by priesthood and sacrifice was a true instinct. And as Christianity gathered up into itself the Logos of Greek thought and the order of Rome, together with revelations made through Hebrew prophet and seer, it made them all of use in the service of Christ.

Sometimes we hear the old political ecclesiastic striving to arouse party passion, just as the Pharisees did of old. It is said we are going back to Medievalism. This is practically to accuse us of insanity. The hands of the clock of time cannot be turned backwards. No sane person thinks to revive the past. We cannot bring back medieval or primitive times if we would. To bring back the primitive worship we should be obliged to have its environment. But as the truth has been the same throughout all the centuries since Christ, so, while the Church has been drawn in her devotions to various aspects of her Lord and new expressions of her love,

have the principles of Divine worship been the same. Separated as the East and West have been for near a thousand years, separated as the heretical bodies of the early centuries have been from one another, they all alike have retained priesthood and altar and sacrifice, with a common ceremonial of lights and incense, and priestly vestments and ordered liturgy, and lowly prostrations and the oft-repeated sacred sign.

But — and here we meet the most formidable and deep-rooted objection — it is said we are copying Rome. No matter what the Bible says, or how the primitive Church worshiped God, lights and incense and vestments are Popish. "It is the Mass in masquerade." It is very curious to notice that the more unreasonable an objection is, the more obstinately it retains its hold on certain minds. This latter reminds us of an insane person who had an abnormal persuasion that he had glass legs; and the more he looked at them the more vehemently he declared that they were nothing but glass. Of course the Roman ceremonial and our own, as our Liturgies have largely the same Western origin, must be somewhat alike. Such attendants as lights, incense, and vestments are common to the whole Church of Christ, and no true portion of Christ's Church is without them. But we do not borrow or copy from Rome when we use that which by virtue of our Apostolic descent and Catholic inheritance is our own. We best protest by being Catholic. So in our Hymnal (442) we praise and pray:

"Head of Thy Church beneath,
The Catholic, the True,
On all her members breathe,
Her broken frame renew!"

Then we have what may be called the newspaper argument. All this ceremonial and ritual is unmanly. It is foreign. It is contrary to the spirit of the age. This does not appear to be true when we look at the growth of secret societies, with their ornate and elaborate ritual. But were it so, is the Church, chameleon-like, to change its color with the world's passing phases, or is it to be like the immovable rock against which the waves of the sea vent their strength in vain? Is the Church to crouch before the world and do its bidding, or bear a St. John Baptist witness against it? The world is bound to hate us. The greater the world's opposition, the surer sign the Church is doing its duty. As we come to the last days, the more the Church and the world must separate. The despised living witnesses, the Word and the Sacraments, over which the world has rejoiced as dead, will rise up and their power shall bring on the Second Coming and the world's overthrow.

The last commonplace argument is: You are undoing the work of the Reformation. For myself, and I believe I can speak for all of you, we hold the Reformation was a necessity, and the principles of Church reform which the Reformers avowed, correct. We are not indeed bound by their private or individual theological opinions, any more than Ameri-

cans are bound by all the political utterances of the founders of our country. As Americans, we are bound by our written Constitution, and as Catholic Churchmen, by our Prayer Book. As Americans we know our Constitution is to be interpreted by the principles of our inherited common law, and as Churchmen we hold our Prayer Book is to be interpreted by the Traditions of the Catholic Church. The Priesthood, the Scriptures, the Councils, the Sacraments, these are four great anchors that securely hold the ship:

> "Four great anchors—tried sheet anchors,
> Each one in itself a host,
> Those infrangible Evangels
> Welded by the Holy Ghost."

We have dwelt, brethren, upon a topic which is a commonplace with you. But you may find this address useful to read to your people. It is not so much newness of thought they need, but the reiteration of the old truths which have been held from the beginning. What our Church people require, as late events have shown, is a better grasp of the fundamentals of the Faith. Of these, just now, that of the first importance is the right principle of Christian worship and the honor due to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. Let the belief in the Real Objective Presence of Christ come to be the common belief of clergy and laity, and the Church will increase in spiritual strength in a way she has not yet known. God grant it, and bless all who are laboring for the increase of His Kingdom.

Commending you all to His love and care, and praying for your increase in all gifts and graces, and asking your remembrance in return where such is of most avail, even at the altars of our Blessed Lord.

We are yours ever in the Catholic Faith,

CHARLES C. GRAFTON,
Superior General, C. B. S.

A LETTER

BY THE SUPERIOR GENERAL TO THE DIRECTORS OF THE PROVINCES OF THE C. B. S.

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
FOND DU LAC, WISCONSIN

MY DEAR FATHER:

THE Council of the C. B. S. has thought it a wise plan and one likely to increase the efficiency of the Confraternity to organize it into Districts, each of which is to have its Director. These Districts number now fourteen and extend over the whole country. I understand from the Rev. Secretary General you have signified your willingness to act as Director in your District and I take great pleasure in giving you this appointment. A great pressure of work and a desire to consult with others has hindered my writing you before.

You will receive if you have not done so a list of the Priests Associate in your District, and a list of the Lay Associates will be sent you if you desire.

The object of this District system is to make each a center of fresh effort for the growth of the Confraternity and those objects which it has at heart.

We feel that with so many of our Priests and Communicants failing to believe in the Real Presence the work of the Confraternity is hardly begun. If our Church is to become Catholic, the Confraternity will be the chief instrumentality in its becoming so.

One way of doing this would be by holding a yearly Conference of the priests of each District. It might be on the Octave of Corpus Christi. At this time a Celebration would be held with such reverent adjuncts as the Church and Rector deemed proper. The Confraternity is bound by no special directory of Ritual, yet we all are striving for the six points of Ritual where they may be had. A priest alone by himself cannot have a Solemn Celebration with deacon and sub-deacon and few know the proper ceremonial. But it would be a worthy offering to God if in each District once a year at least the brethren could meet together and arrange for a Solemn Celebration. It would be a teaching to the priests themselves and to those who might attend.

At the Conference intercessions might be used, papers might be read and questions regarding the Blessed Sacrament discussed and the best ways of conducting our monthly meetings shown, and how by tracts and other means the Confraternity and its objects might be made known. We must "press on the Kingdom."

There are many signs that devout churchmen are awaking to the fact that our Lord is the Living Center of the Church, that a right belief in the Real

Presence is the guardian of sound doctrine and that devotion to Christ in the Sacrament of His Love is the most efficient means to rouse the Church and draw men unto Him.

Great problems are before the Anglican Church and great trials threaten her within. Who can know them better than yourselves. We must rally to our Lord with renewed dedication and like the Apostles in the midst of the storm make earnest prayer for our deliverance.

A Director can by his correspondence and by going about his District organizing Wards, admitting priests, finding out the needs of poor churches for proper vestments and Altar Lights and keeping in touch with the Secretary General, exercise a great influence. Not the least will be that which helps the clergy to keep in their teaching to the right proportion of the Faith. In their warmth they sometimes exceed the bounds of exact theological statement. In their ardor they are prone to try experiments with the public services which are more archeological than practical. You know how closely the Catholic party is watched. How our opponents are on the lookout to create prejudices against us. How our words and acts are misconstrued. How we have lost, in places, a fair hearing by the charge that we are Romanizing. How the Catholic movement has been put back by the fads and extravagancies, indeed lawlessness, of a few. Can we not learn some wisdom from the past and for the good of the cause practice some self-restraint?

In stating the doctrine of the Real Presence it is not *necessary* in my judgment, to use the term Transubstantiation. The Church Catholic has never defined the "How" of the great mystery. We do not need to burden our presentation of the truth with unnecessary difficulties. What we want to teach is the vital truth of our Lord's Real Presence. The concurrent teaching of the Catholic Church is, that by virtue of the Consecration our Lord is verily and indeed present under the recognized species with which He is sacramentally identified. No accredited theologian asserts that Christ comes down, or that there is any change of locality made by His Glorified Body. He does not move about when the sacrament is distributed to the communicants, or borne in procession. He who is at the Right Hand of Power, and in Whose Presence the whole Church ever is, gathers, by the consecration, the elements into union with Himself, just as He did at the upper chamber, and they become in the divine Mystery what His Word declares them to be. He thus under the sacramental veils manifests Himself to us. It is not rightly said that we worship the Host. Our acts of love and homage have for their proper terminus His Divine Person which is the only proper object of worship. It is as when, in the presence of His Visible Humanity which veiled His Divine Nature, St. Thomas said, "My Lord and My God."

Let us also try by loyalty to our own Liturgy to remove the prejudice which keeps so many back

from joining us. When asked about the wisdom of altering the order of our Mass and putting the Gloria in Excelsis at the beginning of it, I have said along with most of our leading churches that I did not think it any gain to do so. It was the primitive arrangement, and may be rubrically defended. But we lose by it. By the overruling of God's Holy Spirit our Reformers were led to insert the Gloria in Excelsis as an act of worship after (see Rubric in Ordination of Priests), "the Communion was done." Unlike the Roman Order where the priest consumes after the Communion of himself, our Liturgy enforces the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament not for any purpose of Communion but for worship. In our Lord's Sacramental Presence we sing our Gloria in Excelsis. This act carries the whole principle of the Reserved Sacrament and it is unwise for us by removing this great hymn of worship from its place to throw away this testimony of our Church to the principle and practice of Reservation.

Again, I hold that we have a right to Reserve in certain cases, for the communion of the sick by the altered language of our American Rubric. For the Rubric does not bid the priest consume what remains at the end of the service but what remains "after the Communion." Now in a Rubric in the "Ordination of a Priest," the Communion is said "to be done" when the people have communicated. The priest may therefore set apart enough to reserve for the sick at the end of the Canon. He can then use the rest for communicating the people and consume

of this portion what remains when the Communion is done. This is what our Rubric literally interpreted allows. But let our Reservation be for the sick or otherwise this privilege which after years of trouble we are just gaining will be by legislation taken way from us.

If the Blessed Sacrament is thus reserved it must of course be treated with reverence. This is also a matter of rubrical direction. And the Church shows us how to do this by the use she makes of the Gloria in Excelsis. It is, let me say by way of caution, a mistaken manner of putting it, to say it is for the purpose of "adoration." This gives our opponents an advantage over us. It is for something of larger import than adoration. It is for the purpose of developing our spiritual commerce with our Lord and our abiding spiritual communion with Him. It is a carrying on of the devotion our Church has instructed us in by placing the Gloria in Excelsis where it is.

In trying to make our beloved Church in action what we know she is in her Prayer Book, we must think of our fellow-workers and so act as not to imperil the general cause. A few men may wreck it by their indiscretions. Look at England. The work in England has been injured by the action of those, who have considered what was possible in their own parishes, but without considering the effect on the movement. Let us try and keep step together. Let us yield points rather than get adverse decisions by Ecclesiastical Courts which will affect the whole

country. Aim at making your services devotional rather than attractive. Do nothing simply because Rome does it. Union with Rome is not our issue. It is not what we are working towards or for. Ours is the duty to teach not Romanism but Catholicity. We have our own Catholic Liturgy and our own special work to do. Our Bishops will as a rule treat us fairly if we are loyal to the Church. The future is not with the Latin Race or its Church, but under God with your own.

CHARLES C. GRAFTON,
Superior General, C. B. S.

Lent 1903

THE CATHOLICITY OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

THE SUPERIOR GENERAL'S ADDRESS (1907)

REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN OF THE CONFRATERNITY:

ALL bright blessings and joys be yours on this great festival. Surely if we can keep Thanksgiving Day for the fruits of the earth, we may well keep one for the greater gift of the Bread from Heaven. I can say nothing to you, dear Brethren, which you do not already know, and therefore my words to-day must simply be the echo of your own hearts. Let our conference be on the condition of our own Church, the contest which has arisen within her and the outlook.

What has been long foreseen has culminated in an

open and organized effort to destroy the Catholicity of our Church. Under the influence of the scientific discovery of the last century men adopting the theory of evolution have questioned the divine origin of the universe and with it a revealed religion. The theory of evolution was only the discovery of a fuller *process* in the development of the universe, but not a discovery of *origin*. It does not involve the disbelief in an intellectual power working out creation's plan. The development of higher from lower forms of life was not a new idea to the Church, and had been asserted as long ago as St. Augustine's time. One of the ablest thinkers of our time, not a churchman, Prof. John Fiske, pointed out the fact that the disturbance occasioned by the discovery was not so great in religious matters as that when the Copernican system was discovered. But from the superficial presentation of the new discovery in magazines and by popular orators, the world, ever willing to escape its obligations to God, took up the lines of agnosticism.

The greater thirst for wealth developed by the spectacle of rapidly acquired and enormous fortunes also helped to paralyze men's souls to their spiritual aspirations and made them indifferent to religion. It is thus more difficult than ever to arouse degenerate human nature, inflated with the pride of its achievements in science, to a belief in God or to the offer of Heaven. The man of the world bends over his muck rake and will not lift his eyes to the Beatific vision; and the proffered crown, by his neglect here,

he will lose forever. The sceptic smiles his sickly smile of cultivated scepticism and rejects the witness borne by the Christian consciousness to revelation, by the indwelling of God within the soul.

Yet, if there is not a God behind the Cosmos and we are but the results of fortuitous atoms, driven hither and thither, the sport of blind mechanical forces, then the universe is a horrible nightmare and annihilation were better than life. But our moral nature, as trustworthy as our bodily one, cries out against the theory which makes us madmen and the world a dream. The Cosmos is not a horror, but an intellectual wonder; and the Christian consciousness bears witness by its own union with its author, that there is a God. We know who He is, and that He dwells within us.

Along with this agnostic spirit there has arisen within the Church a school, that in the person of its pioneers, sought to meet this spirit of unbelief on its own grounds. The motive was commendable, but like all such movements, had its own dangers. The evangelical movement lost sight of the objective side of Christianity with the Church and its Sacraments. The Anglican was apt to forget that the Anglican communion was only a part of the Holy Catholic Church and subordinate to it.

While the Broad Churchman, governing himself by reason, neglected the value of tradition and authority in attempting to satisfy the unbelief of the world, the school was led by its rationalism, in its extreme developments, to impute an ignorance

to our Blessed Lord, which involved a denial of His Deity. With a diminished belief in the supernatural, it has largely rejected the miraculous in the Old and New Testament. It has questioned so much the authenticity and inspiration of the Gospels as to be forced to make a distinction between a rejected "historical Christ" and a creation of their own imagination, which they called an "essential one." Along with this, as you well know, many have gone on to the further stage of unbelief and questioned our Lord's birth of the Blessed Virgin and the resurrection of His crucified body from the tomb.

It is, moreover, contended that the Anglican Communion has broken with the fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, and adopted the Nestorian heresy that God took upon Himself the nature of *a* man, not of man. The ordinary layman does not understand the importance of the distinction. But if the Anglican Communion had decreed this, it would have apostatized and ceased to be a part of the Holy Catholic Church. No sincere believer in Christ and His Church could in safety to his soul remain in union with her. The history of the Reformation clearly shows that no such idea was in the mind of the Reformers, and there was no intention of breaking the continuity of the Church. Whatever changes were made at that time, the Church preserved the ancient Faith, ancient Priesthood and the ancient Worship. It was on this profession on the part of the Anglican Church that you and I, my Brethren, were led to give our lives and all that we

have to the Church's service. We believe that the Church was honest and true in holding out to us that she was a branch of the Catholic Church, and not a deceiving harlot, endeavoring to entrap us into her embrace to ruin our lives in this world and our souls in the next. We must, therefore, with all the powers we possess, stand by her in this great emergency, and be willing, if so it is God's pleasure, to die as martyrs in her cause. Here, Christ by His Providence has placed us, and as it is as great an act of desertion for a soldier in battle to leave one post for another as to run away, so would it be for us to leave the position in Christ's Church assigned us by our great Commander.

We cannot be too thankful for the decision made in the Crapsey case, and the retirement from the ministry, by some of the Broad Churchmen. Their position is an illogical one and morally untenable. But, nevertheless, we must recognize the strength of this Broad Church party, that has a great many sympathizers, who cautiously, without committing themselves, uphold it. The Broad theology pleases the worldly and rationalistic mind. It makes no great demand upon faith, it presents an easy course of life, it satisfies the natural religious spirit by the philanthropic works in which it is engaged. It is championed by men of large wealth and by many of the wealthier Churches throughout the East. It has captured many sources of influence. It covers up its heresies by posing as liberal. It manifests little experience of the Gospel system of salvation or

of the higher walks of the Saintly life. It is by its rationalism a formidable and threatening power to the inherited Catholicity of our Church. What, dear Brethren, in this aspect of the case shall we do?

First, let us gratefully remember the marvelous Providence of God that has watched over our own Church, for its protection in faith and its deliverance from its enemies. It is indeed marvelous to see how the hand of God has been over it, guiding and protecting it. What a wonderful Providence, for instance, was that of the early death of King Edward the Sixth. Had that young Tudor, "Tiger Cub," as Dean Stanley called him, lived, he would, as he threatened to do, have thoroughly Protestantized the Church by his innovations. It was a costly trial to have Mary on the throne, but it was worth it to get rid of Edward the Sixth. What a merciful Providence was that which in Queen Elizabeth's time, defeated by storm, the Spanish Armada, and preserved the Church from being brought again under the dominion of a medieval papacy. Nor was Cromwell and his Puritan hosts of fanatics able to crush or destroy the Church. It rose from its ashes resuscitated with life and faith, yet to meet a more severe trial. The withdrawal of the Saintly Nonjurors exposed the Church to the evils of an Erastian policy. We may have sometimes complained of the tyranny that closed the mouth of Convocation, which was the Church's council, for about 150 years. But when we think of the Church in that period, the character of its Bishops, its decay in doctrine and

spirituality, we can be thankful that the Church in England was thus padlocked and rendered officially dumb. Again, in the last century, though it seemed at first like a blow to the Catholic cause, that it was deserted by Newman and some others, yet the great movement was protected thereby from falling under the leadership of any one man. The revival of Catholicity in the Church was seen to be of God, not of man; for man neither made nor could man mar it.

Very grateful indeed we ought to be to God, that in America the Church refused the offer made by Coke and Asbury, the superintendents of the Methodist body here, to join us and bring the followers of their society into the Episcopal Church, their proposal being that they should be made Bishops. Sometimes persons have thought that the Church lost a great opportunity. Really the Church saved herself from destruction. Had this large body of uninstructed and imperfectly formed Christians become a part of our Church they would have swamped us.

What a blessing we also have in our own American Church in the withdrawal, some years ago, under Bishop Cummins, of the Low Church party. They disbelieved in Baptismal Regeneration and the Sacramental system generally. They sought through the General Convention, just as the Broads are about to do now, to get the Prayer Book so changed that they could conscientiously say the Offices and stay in the Church. But the good God

enabled the Church to stand firm and reject their proposals, and they, like honest men, withdrew from our communion. Their withdrawal and the rise of their sect is a living witness of the truth of the Catholic position and the loyalty of the Catholic-minded Churchmen to the Prayer Book.

Another notable Providence we may observe in England, where the Civil Courts fell into such deplorable contradictions respecting the Church's worship. Their decisions so discredited their authority as to lead men to reject them and feel their way towards disestablishment. Until the Church there is free from State control, she can never fully recover her Catholic heritage. As it was the oppressions of Pharaoh that led to Israel's deliverance, so through the sufferings of the Church she will at last be made free. The Church is not for the glorification of any country, but for the saving and training of souls for the kingdom of Heaven.

We believe another sign of God's Providential care is to be seen in the late rejection of our orders by the Papacy. It was, as we know, a mere political decision, and not a theological one. Knowing, as Anglicans do with absolute and divine certainty, that they are possessed of a priesthood and Sacraments, the Papal decision declared its own fallibility as clearly as when once the Papacy decided that the delivery of the instruments was essential to Ordination. Had the decision been in favor of our Orders it would have led to a great outburst of enthusiasm in behalf of the Papacy, and possibly the formation

of a Uniat Church. God preserved our Church from thus committing suicide.

Here in America let us also be thankful for the attack made on the Church's faith by the extreme broad church rationalistic party. For many years past these dangerous errors of unbelief have been silently working, creeping like concealed fire through every department of the Church's life. It is a great mercy that an explosion took place in the McQuery and Crapsey cases. The latter roused the most slumbering conservative churchmen to the danger that threatens our Church's life. It is a cry of alarm like that that roused the sleeping prophet bound with withes. "The Philistines are upon thee." The present danger is so great that all conservative churchmen of both high and evangelical schools should draw together and make common cause against the common enemy. It becomes us, of the so-called Catholic party to avoid, as far as possible, giving any occasions of controversy or causes of alarm, and winning confidence by our loyal adhesion to the Prayer Book.

In the face of so great and unexaggerated danger, you naturally ask, "What further shall we do?" Dear Brethren, you and the Confraternity have a great mission from God. He has given you the enlightenment of the Catholic Faith and placed the great weapon of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in your hands, and you can daily plead the great memorial before the Almighty God, whose power nothing can resist. As surely as the walls of old fell before the

hosts of Israel, marching with the Ark round Jericho, so will the walls of heresy fall at the persevering offerings of the Holy Eucharist. We must offer the Holy Sacrifice daily with great faith and devotion, and put our trust in the Lord.

And, as a further defense, may I again ask your interest in forwarding the development of religious Orders and Communities in our Church? They claim God's special protection and bring a special spiritual blessing and power to our communion. I took the liberty lately of sending you, my Brethren of the Clergy, an address prepared by a Religious of one of our Sisterhoods, which you might read on some occasion to your people. Church parents must be taught to realize that the highest honor Christ can do them is to call a son to the Priesthood or a daughter to the Religious life. God, who has a right to take any child away by death, has a right to call one into His service here. His call is always one to two parties, parents to give up, the child to come; and if obedient to Him, each will have part of the reward. To hinder or put obstacles in the way of a response to vocation is a grievous sin. I do not press this matter upon you more, but I feel that in a daily Eucharist and a revival of the religious life lies the safety of our Church.

We must encourage ourselves by the remembrance that we are living in the last times, and if the last final conflict with Anti-Christ is dawning upon us, we must lift up our heads, knowing our redemption draweth nigh. The Church Militant, which in an-

swer to our Lord's prayer preserved an outward union as well as an inward unity for about 1000 years, has, like Israel before it, rich as it was in promises, become divided. The desire for a visible head or monarch led to Israel's disruption, and the same cause has led to that in the Christian Church. We see no Providential signs that the breach in Western Christendom will ever be healed. It is possible that inter-communion might be restored with the East, and it must first be restored with the East before that in the West can take place.

The types and prophecy of Christ seem, however, to point to the Church's apparent failure. "When Christ cometh will He find faith on the earth?" In every nation Christ must first be preached as a witness and then the blessed end will come. It is ours to make ready for it, by training souls in the spiritual life. Within the Church, as the time draws near, there will be a revival of saintliness and of that we see some signs. For that let us labor and in peace of mind leave the future to God.

I regret that the holding of my Diocesan Council prevents my being in bodily presence with you. I send you my sincere and loving greetings and benediction in the Lord. May He enlighten, bless and protect you in all your work for Him, in all your going out and coming in, until we all come to that blessed state where there is no more a coming in or a going out, but a rest eternal in His love and bliss.

C. C. Fond du Lac,
Superior General, C. B. S.

THE ADDRESS OF THE SUPERIOR GENERAL
(1909)

REVEREND FATHERS AND DEAR BROTHERS OF THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT:

ACCEPT my loving greetings, and benediction in the Lord. May we all draw nearer to each other in His love and grace. We have a special need to do this in times like our own, when the clouds of threatening heresy hang over us, and the enemy of souls is so subtly active, and the coming of our Lord's chariot, as we may believe, is speeding on.

Every fresh Church festival should strengthen and encourage us in our purpose to defend the Holy Faith, and to grow in mutual charity, and spiritual union with our hidden and dear Lord.

There are two aspects of our Lord which come out in the Gospels and Revelation, to which, by others' wisdom, I have been, especially of late, drawn. He is represented to us both as Master, and as Lord. As our Master, He is our most loving Friend, Companion, abiding Protector, tenderest and dearest Love of our souls. We are drawn into most familiar walking and confidence in Him. We may speak to Him in all the simplicity of children, and in all the tender and affectionate language of a lover. Dear Jesus is our Jesus. We must call Him again and again by His most loving title. We must let that personal tie grow deeper and more permanent. We want to love Him with an obedient love, a faithful love, a true love, an overcoming love, a

love above all other loves, an abandoning love, an all-consuming love. We desire to enter more and more into His life, principles, feelings, emotions. Let our trials be shared with His trials, our troubles with His troubles, our little crosses with His great cross. We should turn to Him at all times, in the first act of our morning cross, to the last when we repose at night. He is ever abiding with us, speaking to us, alluring us, comforting us, infusing His love into us, that the divinely-given love may grow in love of Him. O sweet blessed companionship! O divine, blessed resting place! Not John only, but we, His disciples, may learn to rest on His bosom. This is that sweet, gentle, loving, all-controlling companionship that grows and deepens between ourselves and our dearest Lord. He is our hope, our tranquillity, our riches, our strength; our Love, our All-in-All. The great gift of God to man is this companionship with Jesus.

But there is another aspect in which He stands toward us, and we to Him. He is our Lord. He is the Lord of Glory. He is no longer worshiped in the outward garment of a poor and suffering humanity. He is no longer to outward appearance as He was when He walked through the fields in Galilee, or rocked in the boat on its lake, or spoke from the hillside. He had laid aside His glory, and in the likeness of sinful flesh had appeared like one of us. He was destitute of all the insignia of His glory, majesty and power. After His Resurrection and His Ascension He put on glorious apparel. The

divine nature glorified His humanity. His blessed Form glowed with the light beyond the brightness of the sun, as on the day of His Transfiguration. Majestic in His splendor, clothed with the symbolic vestment of His loyalty, and priesthood, St. John fell at His feet as if dead. He, who had been admitted to such tender and loving familiarity, nevertheless overcome by the radiant glory of His person, could only fall prostrate before Him, as dead. That same majestic splendor as it appeared to Saul on the way to Damascus, cast Him to earth, and he ever wore His certain blindness as a token of Christ's glorified Presence.

Beyond all description of word or thought is the Person of our Blessed Lord, now at the right hand of God the Father. His human flesh is filled with the glory and power which surpasses all man can conceive, and which is to be the sustaining power of man in his glorified condition. O great, O marvelous contrast! At once our Master, alluring us into the most tender companionship, and also our adorable Lord and God, before whom it is our highest joy to be as dust under His feet.

Now these two aspects of our divine Lord are wonderfully brought out in the dear Sacrament of His love. There in mercy hiding His glory lest it blind us, He sits enthroned amongst His people. A cloud veils His splendor, in mercy, from our visible sight. His marvelous condescension kindles our gratitude and devotion, and we learn to be dead to self, living in Him. Blessed, indeed, is that pro-

cess of self-destruction, in which self-love and self-interest die. Blessed that spirit of self-abrogation and resignation of all into His hands. Blessed are they who are spiritually dead here, and who die in the Lord. Blessed are they who, united to Him crucified, and buried with Him, have risen with Him, and are living with Him in a supernatural union consummated in the Eucharist. But O, here in the dear Sacrament of His love, we find in the most tender way, a realization of the companionship of Christ. He is with us, and we are with Him. We can tell Him of every trial, every sorrow, as well as of every joy. He gathers, not only our petitions, but ourselves up into His sacred Heart. Happy children, to be as incense consumed in the censor of His love. It is this revelation of Christ in the Eucharist as our Lord, and as our dearest companion that the strength of the Catholic movement consists.

You all know, dear Brothers, that no great religious cause ever succeeds which is chiefly an intellectual one. It must be devotional. It must be something more than devotional. It must have in it the warm, tender action of piety. The question before you, dear Brothers, is how to awaken this in your own hearts and the hearts of your people. We have to teach them, of course, about the Real Presence. We need to teach the great doctrines of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. We need to make them realize that offering of the Holy Eucharist is the great act of Sunday worship.

But we want them to love it, and to surround it

with all the dignity of beauty of worship; and we want, above all, to kindle in their hearts an intense feeling of personal love to our dear Lord in the Eucharist. There, He trusts Himself to us. There, He puts His Sacramental Body, as it were, under the jurisdiction of His priests. There, He allows them to enter into the very mysteries of Heaven itself. "What," a holy man has said, "should make you fear or despond, when you hold in your hands the Bread of Life, and can drain the Chalice of the Divine Victim?" It is to a daily Eucharistic Sacrifice that the victory of the Saints is given. It is through it, and by means of it, our own branch of the Church shall recover her heritage.

Be ingenious for the introduction of hymns, or acts of devotion, to stimulate the piety of your people. With a love that is beyond human love, let us develop within the Church a love to our Blessed Lord. We must sing our hymns to Him, prostrate ourselves before Him, cherish Him in our hearts, and ever come back to Him. May He touch our hearts and minds with a coal of fire from His divine Altar, and fill us with a new spirit, new intention, new devotion, new consecration to Jesus. Let us love our Confraternity, and press on His Kingdom.

C. C. Fond du Lac,
Superior General, C. B. S.

ADDRESS OF THE SUPERIOR GENERAL, (1910)

Rev. and Dear Fathers and Associates of the C. B. S.:

RECEIVE my loving greetings in the Lord and fellowship in the Catholic Faith.

As we look back for a large number of years, we have much to be thankful for. There has been a great growth in our own Communion in the knowledge of the Catholic Faith, and especially of belief in the objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

When I was a young man there was scarcely a parish where the Holy Sacrifice was offered every Sunday. Now, through the larger part of our country, the offering of it is the rule rather than the exception. The general principles concerning the worship have become almost universal. The use of proper Eucharistic vestments and lights, which were once unknown, have largely been adopted. The Eastward position is most continually taken, and there are now few, if any, objections to the use of wafer bread.

While there is yet much to be gained, yet the attitude of our Church toward the Blessed Sacrament has greatly improved in reverence and devotion. What we should earnestly strive for is that the offering of the Sacrifice should be made a permanent Sunday service. It cannot in all parishes be introduced at once, and our people have to be prepared for it. Our clergy must use their own discretion in the manner of its introduction.

It appears to me that we are to train our people in the art of devotion. If we can teach them to realize our Lord's presence, and to accompany the Mass with special petitions of their own, they will come to love it. But we have in some cases to go slowly. We may all of us remember the remark St. Aidan made, when a missionary from his monastery was sent to convert the Angles, and returned with the news that they were so hard and barbarous he could make nothing of them. Aidan remarked that he had evidently expected too much at first, and that he must remember the injunction of St. Paul that the uninstructed must be fed first with milk before they received the meat of the full Word. It requires an enthusiastic patience to deal with our uninstructed, or especially with old-fashioned high church people. These latter think they know all, and are as unwilling to take further instruction as the bigoted low churchmen, with their cry of "Romanism."

Where it is possible, will not all the clerical members of the Confraternity offer the Eucharist daily?

I have advised in my own diocese that they should take a small chapel or sacristy, if need be, and put in a small altar, where the service might be held.

The development of a priest's inner life depends so much upon this, and in no other way can he bring such a blessing upon the parish or the Church at large.

We must march round the walls of the wordly Jericho, sounding our trumpet, bearing the Ark of

the Covenant, and wait on God's time for the walls to fall down.

If ever there was a need of special intercessions, I think it is now. A worldly spirit has arisen in our Church, more anxious for its numerical growth than for the deepening of its piety.

We must all be thankful for an aroused missionary zeal amongst the laity. In every way we can we should take advantage of it, but we cannot be too careful to guard our beloved Church from yielding any principle of the inherited Faith. We must love all who call themselves Christians, and in matters in which principle is not involved, unite ourselves with them. But a Church which has received the great treasure of Apostolic Succession must not compromise her position by an allowed open pulpit.

This has not yet been granted, and we pray it never may be. It would be no kindness to our sectarian friends, and would not bring God's blessing on ourselves. Let us be faithful to the trust we have received, and let nothing drive us from our posts.

The Church is Christ's, and He who has protected our Communion through the last three centuries in a most wonderful manner, will not desert us. If he did not desert the Church in the coldness of the eighteenth century, He will not desert her, as Dr. Pusey said, now that she is on her knees.

May I humbly and respectfully make a caution?

There will probably be an effort made to legislate on the subject of the Reservation of the Blessed

Sacrament. Legislation was checked at the last General Convention, but we are informed that it is likely to be renewed at the coming one. I have endeavored to set forth in an article in the *Living Church*, of the 27th inst., the legal argument in favor of it.

I believe that the honest and legal construction of the Rubric at the end of the Service does not forbid it. Reservation for the sick in no way contradicts the teaching of the Prayer Book or the Articles. If it is reserved, proper reverence and devotion necessarily are paid to the person of our Blessed Lord, shrined within His gifts. But in these arguments the objection is made that the Blessed Sacrament is used for purposes other than its institution. It is brought up against us that in some places the office of Benediction is used. Whilst I can see nothing myself in this beautiful service which is theologically incorrect, its introduction gives a handle to those who object to every kind of Reservation. Instances of this service, and also of carrying the Blessed Sacrament in procession, are brought up to arouse the prejudice of party spirit that is opposed to belief in the Real Objective Presence. It is, therefore, my judgment, poor as it may be, that it would be wise to cease these two forms of devotion. We cannot claim for Benediction that it was a pre-Reformation service, to which we have inherited a right, and there is no legal ground on which to stand in favor of its introduction. What may happen at the coming General Convention we do not

know, but we earnestly ask all to offer constantly the daily Sacrifice, that God would so overrule its action that no harm should be done to the inherited Catholic Faith.

My dear brethren, we must look forward with heroic courage and conquering faith, and enflamed love, and trusting in the Great Head of our Church, stand firm and immovable in our positions, and go forward. I believe we are the most true and loyal expounders of our Book of Common Prayer, and that a great work has been committed to us by the Divine Head in our portion of the Catholic Church.

And in forwarding this blessed and glorious mission, let me commend to my clerical brethren the privilege of speaking on behalf of the religious life — both for men and for women. It is the highest life of noble Christian sacrifice. Sometimes when it looks dark, and the worldly spirit seems increasing in the legislative bodies of our Communion, it is a comfort and joy to think of the lives of self-sacrifice so many noble priests and women are living.

I hope the old slogan may still be true: "The broad Church has money, but the Catholic party has the spirit of sacrifice." We can live for God and Christ. We can, we must, sometimes suffer. Blessed is it if we lay down our lives for Him.

With my loving greetings and blessing in the Lord,

Yours very faithfully in Him,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

CONFRATERNITY ADDRESS
(1911)

REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN, AND MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES OF THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT:

WE send you, as your Superior General, our Loving Greetings and Episcopal Benediction.

You have been called to do a great work for God the Lord by bearing witness to His Veiled Presence in the Blessed Sacrament.

A cloud received Him out of the Apostles' sight on the Day of His Ascension. It may have been a cloud of blessed Angels. It was surely a figure of His veiled Presence in the Blessed Sacrament. The great truth of His Abiding Presence in the Church is often neglected. Christ is thought of as having gone to some distant star. But he promised to be with us, always, unto the world's end.

What Almighty God is to the natural universe, a God immanent within it, that the God-Man, Jesus Christ, is to the new spiritual organism He is developing out of it. The three great acts of God, which stand related to one another in logical order, are: First, His act of Creation. God made all things by His Word, where before nothing was. Then the Word, or Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, became Incarnate, and the Word was made Flesh. Then, O greater mystery of Love, the Incarnate Word took the Bread into His hand and said: "This is my Body," and of the Cup, "This Cup is the New

Covenant in my Blood." Thus He created the World, and by His Incarnation united man to Himself, and in the Holy Eucharist unites us to Himself by His personal indwelling. It is this wonderful and blessed mystery you are specially called upon to bear witness to and to guard.

You know you are a part of a great spiritual movement which was begun by Saints in the last century, and has transformed the Church. It has enabled it to recover very largely its Catholic heritage. No part of this is more valuable than belief in the real Objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The question is sometimes asked, perhaps in moments of despondency: "Has this great Catholic movement spent its force?" The great leaders and saints who founded it have passed to their reward. They are, we believe, watching events with the same devoted interest that filled them when on earth. They not only form part of the great crowd of witnesses by which we are surrounded, but they intercede for us. The volume of prayer thus daily increases. Its efficiency grows, since the saints are nearer to Christ. We are forbidden to think that this movement, by God and in God, has spent its force. There are still great and learned scholars who are defending the citadel of the faith. There are still men of growing and saintly lives who bear witness to it. The missionary spirit is not dying out, but is energetically represented in every heathen land. The Religious Orders are steadily increasing in numbers, and are marked by a true spirit of de-

votion. Everywhere in England and America we see that the worship, with its dignified ritual and ceremonial, has greatly improved. The battle over ritual has practically been won. The use of the Confessional has steadily increased. The earlier Tractarian movement affected chiefly the upper and intellectual classes. It touched, indeed, the poor, but the middle class in England was claimed by dissent. Now some impression has been made upon it, and we find Catholics in every class of society. The great public procession lately held in London, led by the Bishop, on Good Friday, testifies to the growing respect for religion. We can but note in our own country the improved Church tone manifested in our late General Convention. One of the good signs is the growing union in our Church, between the Evangelicals and the High Churchmen. There is a better understanding of our position. It is seen that while catholic-minded and conservative of the ancient Faith, we are nevertheless liberal in matters not defined as dogma, and as converted men we have experienced religion. Divided in the technical expression of our Faith, we are nevertheless one. We are divided superficially as the waves are divided, but one as the ocean is one.

While we can honestly say all this and take courage, nevertheless may we not say that these three years, or the time to the next General Convention, are full of import? I know God is with our Church and has protected it in time past, so He will in the future. "As God did not give us up," said Dr.

Pusey, "in the eighteenth century, in the days of our coldness and formality, He will not give us up now, when the Church is on her knees."

But you know, dear Brethren, that no ordinary attack is being made upon the Church, its sacramental teaching, and the Blessed Sacrament. A movement was organized a few years ago by a number of clergy and laity for the avowed object of liberalizing the Church. They want to make the Church as far as possible minimize the supernatural. They go along with that form of the higher criticism that denies the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and does not call it the Word of God. Miracles must be omitted from our faith, because they are contrary to the laws of nature, and so reason and experience. The Church is not a Divine Society to last forever, but a human institution, and no different in kind from that of the Protestant religious bodies. They do not believe, save in a very limited way, in the Church's sacramental system. They deny the necessity of an Apostolic Succession, and are ready to throw open our pulpits, and presently our Altars, to the unepiscopally ordained. They do not believe that the ministers of the Church are priests, though the term "sacerdos" is applied to them in a title to one of our Articles. They above all things reject the Church's doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar.

It would be folly for us to underestimate this attack. Those who lead it are clergy of ability and certain scholarship, and have a large lay and financial

support. Startled into activity by the unexpected Church demonstration at Cincinnati, they have inaugurated an active campaign. Their object is to play upon the prejudices and fears of the laity against Rome, by misrepresenting the "terminus ad quem" of our movement. We are advancing, dear Brethren, as you very well know, not Romewards. The proposed end of our endeavors is not a union of the Church under the Papacy. If the union of Christendom is ever to be attained, it must be on the broad ground of the Faith once delivered — the Faith witnessed in the Councils and teachings of the Fathers in the undivided Church — and to the testimony borne to it by the common consent of the Eastern, Roman and Anglican Churches to-day.

Now, what, we ask, are we, as loyal Churchmen, Catholics and lovers of our Lord, to do? We must enter on a vigorous counter-campaign. We must make an earnest missionary effort. We must strive to get in touch with those now separated from us. We must have a zeal for converting individual souls. Every Churchman won to a belief in the Blessed Sacrament becomes a power in the Church. We must, as priests, offer the Holy Sacrifice daily, if we can. We must encourage devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. We must, by the adornment of our Altars, reverence the Presence of our Lord. We must, by our acts of worship, bear witness to the Presence of Christ. We must get hold of our brother Catholic-minded clergy and induce them to join the Confraternity. If not called ourselves to the Re-

ligious Life, we must encourage the orders of Religious men and women, and seek for vocations for them. These are some of the ways by which we can help on our Lord's great cause.

Brethren, as one who for nigh sixty years, has labored for the restoration of our Church worship and its inherited Catholic Faith; and as a Bishop of the Church of God, however small in place, I send you on this day my love and blessing and this word of encouragement. Christ is with us, and if we are but faithful and seek after sanctity ourselves, and offer the daily sacrifice, He will reward our efforts beyond what we now can conceive.

Commending you to His loving care and blessing,

Your Father in Christ and Superior General,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

The following telegram was received and read to the Conference:

Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, June 6, 1912

My prayers, love and blessing for the members of the C. B. S. in conference to-day,

C. C. Fond du Lac.
Superior General, C. B. S.

GRAFTON HALL ADDRESS

A YOUNG lad about fourteen is lying on his back on the floor, with a book in his hand. It is vacation time. He is reading Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World.* In one of his essays, Goldsmith starts the question, "In what does happiness consist?" The poet said, in a sort of Irish fashion, "It lay in two things, oblivion, respecting the past, and without a thought of the future." If the past was forgotten it couldn't worry you. If the trials of the future were removed from our vision, we should then be in a state of present happiness. I have forgotten just how he put the problem. It was a very fallacious argument. It puzzled, however, the young mind, and set him thinking. It began the first real independent thinking in the young boy's mind. The problem presented was, "In what does man's real happiness consist?" And now the old man like a knight with dinted shield and well-worn armor, comes back from many a hard-fought battlefield, comes to say, that the only true abiding happiness is to be found in religion and union with God.

Religion gives thus happiness, because it effectually unites us to the most blessed, most happy-making of all Beings. God is not only the most majestic, wonderful, glorious, joyous, and happy of all beings, but He is happiness itself. Now religion unites us to Him and fills us with His life. The torrent of pleasure which dwells in this blessed source flows like a river from Him into us. The glorious sunshine of

His divine life gladdens and cheers and fructifies our little lives.

We become like golden specks floating and shining in the sunbeam of His love. We come increasingly to know Him, and rejoice in His fellowship and our dependence on it. God comes to be more and more in us, the life of our life, the soul of our soul. Our nature becomes established in an ordered rest and harmony with itself, and of conscious peace with God. God is realized as our personal friend, and affectionate Father, whose ear is ever open to our prayers, and hand extended to supply all our needs. Nothing escapes His notice, nothing can hinder His protecting care. The dear good angels that wait on Him, wait on us obediently to do His will. We come not only to believe in God, but to know Him. He dwells in us, and we in Him. The Christian walks through life in this divine companionship, and the heavenly light which streams through the open door of Heaven makes the shadow of life's struggles fall behind us. As we bear our Cross after the Master, we find that the Cross indeed bears us. All the many millions of the Redeemed who have gone before bear witness to this inward reign of peace, and the satisfying happiness surpassing all the World can give.

The Adopted Sonship

Religion also clothes us with all the privileges of an adopted Sonship. In Christ we are brought in a new relation with God. By nature we are His creatures. By grace we are Christ's children. We

are made members of Christ, partakers of the divine nature, and an adopted son. Our heavenly Father gathers us, little and needy outcasts, into his own new family. By a divine illumination, and power of love, we become partakers of that divine nature, whose activities are seen in knowing and loving. Made children or members of Christ, we have all the privileges of our adopted state. We have a guaranteed entrance ever to the King, and can come, not like Esther, taking our life in our hand, but ever boldly and of right to the throne of Grace. We sit and eat at the King's table, and His banner over us is love. Moreover there is a difference between the adoption by an earthly Father, and that of our Heavenly one. An earthly Father may adopt a child not his own by birth, and educate him, and give him of his inheritance. But he cannot give him of his own natural life. The adopted relationship is only a moral and legal one. But the divine adoption makes the adopted partake of the divine nature by way of knowledge and love and gift. He is born anew, receives a new nature, a divine illumination, and made worthy to obtain a heavenly and eternal inheritance. An earthly monarch might adopt a subject and make him his heir, but it would be but a temporal honor and a passing glory. But the heavenly king makes us heirs in Christ, of a Kingdom that shall never pass away, and of a fadeless crown.

Religious Life the Happiest

Religion also is the happiest of all lives. It does not secure us from trial or trouble, but it alone knows how to meet them, and the Christian has no fears of the future in this life. He knows he has God always on his side. He is therefore bright, hopeful, faithful in the midst of adversity. No sorrow or affliction can blot out the bright vision of future glory. No cross is so heavy, but the Burden Bearer will not help him bear it. On the other hand, the world is full of calamities and sorrow. Man is born to sorrow as the sparks fly upward. No wonder the natural man therefore is wont to be pessimistic. The buoyant, exulting spirit of the Greeks satisfied with the bright sunshine of earthly pleasure, gave way before great calamities. The optimism of Goethe, with his refined and cultivated selfishness, sunk before the accumulated misery of modern civilization. The English Byron, who said he had scarcely had a happy day in his life, exclaimed in his passionate depression:

> "We are the fools of time and terror, days
> Steal on us and steal from us! yet we live,
> Loathing our life, and dreading still to die."

Christ Condemns Pessimism

But Christ, the victor of death and hell, reverses all this. He condemns this pessimism. "Pessimism," says Liddon, "which is common sense in a heathen, is, in a Christian, disloyalty to Christ.

Optimism, which in a heathen is sheer folly, is in a Christian mere common sense. For the Christian believes in a divine providence: He knows there is a loving God who watches over every sparrow's fall, who hears the cry of every one of his children, and makes all things work together for their good."

Religion is moreover the basis of the beautiful, simple, strong, and useful life. It sees the beautiful everywhere. God is the beautiful one, and nature everywhere reflects his beauty. Nature is but a veil, beneath whose folds he discerns the movements of the beautiful one. Nature is to him a great Cathedral, where alone, in the woods, over the sea, while in the gladsome hum of insect life, or the multitudinous laughter of the waves, he may listen to beauty's song of life. The marvelous variety of floral development made Tennyson exclaim in astonishment, "How wonderful is the imagination of God." Your Easter lilies are perfumed trumpets of the Resurrection. Your roses symbols of the Rose of Sharon. And not alone is beauty found in form and color. There is a legend of our Lord, that as He was passing along a street in Jerusalem, a dead dog lay in the way, and the passers turned their heads from the sight. The divine Master said, "But see, he has beautiful white teeth!" Our sense of beauty becomes elevated when we discern in it moral forms of action. How great, noble, beautiful, are the deeds of self-sacrificing heroes and saints! A soul endowed, with good deeds is beautiful in the sight of angels!

Maybe again, that in a future state, we will have

a beauty manifesting the beauty of the soul. Do we not sometimes see this developing in this life? Religion clothes us with strong and manly virtues. It is at once austere, strong, yet jealous and sensitive. It is austere, because it demands discipline; it is strong, because it must resist the enticements which surround it; it is jealous, because it guards God's honor. Its eye is like flame, and its hand a blazing torch. It is like the Cherubim which guards the gate of Paradise. It is sensitive as the dove which flies at the sound of a footstep. It is like a flower which is stirred by the faintest breeze, and which dies at the embrace of the deadly frost.

But above all, religion is the happiest of lives, for it lives not for itself alone. In this it becomes God-like and divine. It rises above self in its growing unselfishness. It works for humanity, for neighbor, friend, kinsman, and fellow-churchman. Filled with this divine spirit, it finds in service its highest joy. No day without a loving duty, and no duty without its reward.

Live so the World Will be Better

Such, indeed, are some of the truths, my daughters, you have learned from your Alma Mater. Go forth with her blessing, and in Christ's strength. May the *multi anni* bring with increasing experience higher and richer joys. May you so live that the world will be better, because you have lived in it. May the good angels watch over and guard you, and the great Master give you His final welcome!

"Come, children, on and forward!
With us the Father goes;
He leads us and he guards us
Through thousands of our foes:
The sweetness and the glory,
The sunlight of His eyes,
Make all the desert places
To glow as Paradise.

Lo! through the pathless midnight
The fiery pillar leads,
And onward goes the sheperd
Before the flock he feeds;
Unquestioning, unfearing, the lambs may follow on,
In quietness and confidence,
Their eyes on Him alone.

Far through the depths of Heaven
Our Jesus leads His own,
The mightiest, the Fairest,
Christ ever, Christ alone.
Led captive by His sweetness,
And dowered with His bliss,
For ever He is ours,
For ever we are His."

THE REASONABLENESS OF THE CHURCH'S FAITH

BISHOP GRAFTON'S SPEECH AT CHURCH CLUB DINNER

LET me thank you for your kindly welcome. I shall best show my appreciation of it by proceeding at once to my subject. It involves the consideration of some serious religious truths, which would be out of place at any ordinary social dinner,

but cannot be regarded as such in what rises to the dignity of a Christian Agape.

The first point to which I would call your attention is our Church's belief in the Blessed Trinity. It is the most reasonable, philosophical, and satisfactory conception the human mind can have of God. There was a gross misconception of it amongst the old Puritan and Congregational divines of New England. They held that there were three distinct, separate individuals who, taken together, composed the Godhead. This was known as Tritheism. It was commonly represented in pictures where the Eternal Father was represented as an old man, the Son as Christ, and the Holy Spirit by a dove. It was against this error that the early Unitarians revolted, proclaiming the oneness of God. They rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, for the Church's doctrine of the Trinity was then here but little known.

God, in the language of St. Thomas, is pure activity or force. He is Spirit. He is Being. In Him are two internal and eternal activities, viz., knowing and loving. These are eternal activities and are ever going on. The Church's teaching is that each of these is self-conscious. Consequently, as self-consciousness is personality, there are three persons in the Divine Life. Now, this conception is the most reasonable one the human mind can form of God. For, being intelligent, He has within Himself the companionship of like infinite intelligence. And being Love itself, He has within Himself the perfect object and fruition of His own love. The

Being or primal source is known as the Father, the wisdom or knowing which is begotten of the source is called the Son, the love that binds them together is the Holy Ghost. These necessary internal acts are eternal ones. The Son is ever being begotten. The Holy Ghost ever proceeds. In this blessed jubilation of Being, God lives in eternal bliss.

The other view, which reduces Him to one personality, condemns Him to an eternal solitude. A solitude which is destitute of the companionship and love His nature demands, and would make Him the most miserable of all Beings.

The Church's doctrine is thus, the most rational doctrine concerning God.

Again, consider the Church's belief in the Deity of Christ. We are met with various theories concerning Him; each placing Him in different degrees of elevation, but while admitting that He was in some sense a teacher sent from God, denying that He was God Himself.

Now, we contend that the Church's belief in the Deity of Christ is the most consistent and rational one for a Christian to adopt. It is seen to be such from two indisputable facts. First, that God delivered, by a long, disciplinary process, the world from its sin of Idolatry. He did this largely through the Hebrew race. Through it, the World has been taught that there is but one God. The other fact is that since Christ's coming, at least four-fifths of His followers have worshiped Him as God. You see how illogical, then, the theory is that Christ was not

God, but was some created Being or Teacher sent from God. For this involves a contradiction. It supposes that Almighty God, having by the discipline of the Hebrew nation delivered the world from falling into the sin of Idolatry, sent a Teacher into the world who undid His own work and led the larger portion of His followers back into the very sin God had so condemned. Christianity would not, according to this theory, have been a progressive development of true religion, but a retrogression into one of the greatest of sins. The denial of the Deity of Christ is therefore, for any one claiming himself to be a Christian, inconsistent and illogical.

Take again the Resurrection of our Lord and His Virgin birth. We need not detain you with proofs of the former. The fact of the Resurrection rests upon many converging lines of evidence. The Apostolic witnesses were most trustworthy. They laid down their lives for the truth of their testimony. They could not be mistaken. The story of the Resurrection cannot be placed in the category of growing myth and legend, for it was declared, and that publicly, at once. Again, what the Apostles saw was no ghostlike appearance; for our Lord said, "Handle me, and see; for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." The Resurrection was not a mental recurrence of one who had departed, but whose teachings remained in their memory; for some of the greatest truths of the Master were revealed to them after the Resurrection. The Resurrection, moreover, is the necessary fact which accounts

for the transformation of the timid Apostles into heroes and martyrs. It alone can account for the existence and permanence of the Catholic Church. "As the Church is too holy for a foundation of rottenness, so She is too real for a foundation of myth." As to the Virgin birth, it is reasonable. For as the exit of our Lord by His Resurrection and Ascension was a supernatural one, so we may logically infer that His entrance into the world would be equally unique. The Virgin birth in which the Church believes we may observe cannot be called a miracle, if by miracle we mean a violation of nature's recognized law. For our Lord was, if we believe His word, a preëxistent Being. He declared that "before Abraham was, I am." He declared that he had a life and a glory with the Father before the world was. He declared He had come down from Heaven; He was by His own testimony a personal preëxisting Being.

Now, for a preëxisting Being to take upon Himself our nature by a single parentage involves no violation of any known law of nature. On the contrary, for a personal preëxisting Being to have a double parentage and yet preserve a single personality would require a miraculous interference with the ordinary laws of nature. We may then safely rest on the Church's Creed. Our Lord declared that He came down from Heaven, St. Joseph declared he was not His father, and the Ever Blessed Mother gave the account of His conception to St. Luke, the physician and evangelist. The hope implanted in

humanity and shown by heathen ideas of fabled incarnations found its fulfilment in the true one of Jesus Christ. The Church's belief is both uncontradicted by nature's laws, and gives the only satisfactory and reasonable explanation for the existence of the Church.

Take again the matter of Sacerdotalism and Sacraments. It was part of the Divine plan of reconciliation that under Christ, the Great High Priest, there should be other priests and prophets subordinate to Him. It is but following out the natural order and dispensation of Divine Providence, which bestows special gifts and power on some men for the benefit of their fellows. There are thus priests of wealth, priests of knowledge, priests of political power, priests of medical science, priests of the law, and in the Church of Christ, while there are gifts of a personal character, there are also those which belong to her as a corporate body. In this body Christ has ordained that some should represent Him in a special manner in His prophetical, kingly, and priestly offices. Sacerdotalism is thus a rational system in conformity with God's laws in nature. So it is in respect of the sacraments. God does not give or sustain our life immediately by the exercise of His own power, but through ordained instrumentalities. We receive the gift of natural life through human agents and must breathe the air and take our food in order that it may be sustained. So the Church comes to us with the gifts of sacramental Grace. They unite us to the Divine Humanity of

Christ, and we become members of a new race. We receive the strengthening gifts of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation. We are fed with the body and blood of our Lord in the Eucharist. Our Church would have no right to go into communities, where there were already existing religious bodies, if she did not bring gifts which the Sects through having lost the priesthood and Confirmation and the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, cannot bestow. The possession of these gifts of grace by the Church is seen by the results in those who faithfully use them. The world apart from the Church may produce men of certain moral virtues, like Marcus Aurelius or an Emerson; and outside the Church a certain type of the Christian life may be found, but without the full gifts which Christ left His Church, men cannot ordinarily be transformed and elevated to the sanctity of the Saints or to the martyrs and confessors and religious who adorn the Catholic Church.

There are two thoughts with which we will conclude. Lately, we have seen that some of our Unitarian friends have felt aggrieved that they were not invited to coöperate in the federation of those Evangelical bodies which believe in the Deity of Jesus Christ. I have ventured to maintain that the Unitarian system which in the beginning was a natural revolt against Calvinism is unphilosophical and an illogical one, and this attitude of mind, on their part, seems to confirm this conclusion. For, if Jesus Christ is not Almighty God, we who worship Him as

such are, in the language of the New Testament, holding "damnable heresies" and are guilty of the grievous sin of Idolatry. The Unitarians, therefore, should not feel aggrieved at being excluded from the company of those who, from their standpoint, should be regarded as detestable Idolaters. As their system is illogical, their conduct is inconsistent.

Lastly, as believers in a revealed and so supernatural religion, and living within the spiritual organism of Christ's Church, we can find no fault with those who, not being within it, say they cannot believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity of our Lord, our Lord's Resurrection and His Virgin birth, and the Sacraments. The impossibility of their accepting these truths is another proof of the consistency and rationality of the Church's Faith. For these great truths cannot be known by reason alone or by the natural man. The only way the full revelation of God to man in Jesus Christ can be known is by one's becoming a little child in mind and heart and entering within the Spiritual Kingdom of the Church of Jesus Christ, wherein He dwells, wherein He illuminates its members with His Holy Spirit, and by its Sacraments unites them to Himself so that they not only know the truth, but are united to Him who is the Life and the Truth itself, and in whom He fulfils His blessed promise concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that we will love him, and that we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. Devout and faithful Churchmen do not merely hold religious opinions, but they know

with divine certainty the truth and are by union with the deified humanity of Christ elevated into a higher participation of the Divine Nature than comes from the immanence of God, and are made the Sons of God and inheritors in Christ of Eternal Life.

LETTER TO THE ONEIDAS
(1908)

To the Members of the Oneida Tribe:

My dear Sons and Daughters in Christ:

MAY the Blessing of the Good God rest on you and yours. I have you, as you well know, very near my heart. I have been with you as your Bishop nigh to twenty years. In this time we have walked together with God and have come to know and love one another. Now I am getting to be an old man. Before very long I shall enter my eightieth year. So, before I am gathered to my fathers, I want to have a heart-talk with you as my dear children. You belong to the flock over which God has made me a Bishop, and I care both for your earthly and your spiritual good. We can both be very glad that in all ways you have been blessed. Those who can recall the Reservation as it was twenty years ago must see what great gains have been made. You have better homes, better farms, better food and clothes, are better educated and the church and the hospital and parish library and mission house and the Sisters' dwelling are all things you may well be proud and thankful for. I pray God to bless you yet more and more.

And now that I may better be remembered by you when I have gone, I want you to heed my words. Love your tribe. Love the memory of its noble

Christian Chiefs. Love and help one another. Don't stray away to live in cities. Live and work on your farms; there is no work more healthy or happy. Make your homes neat and cheerful and fill them with Love. Let the young men keep themselves temperate and pure and grow in all manly virtues, and give to the maidens they love a true, pure, and good love. Let them beware of liquor, which is the red man's devil and great foe. Do not let the white merchant get you to run up bills and get in debt, for then you will have to mortgage your farms, and so lose them. You have a grand Reservation and good land. Keep it as you and your fathers have. And also be true to your Church, which has so helped you and brought you all these blessings.

Having said this, I want now to leave you a letter telling you about the Church. I know you love it, but I want you, my dear Indians, to know how Christ made it, and how you may know, in this day of many sects, which is the Church Christ founded.

My letter to you will be in four parts.

The first part is about the Church.

Part I

CHRIST FOUNDED OR BEGAN THE CHURCH

Christ did not only preach and work Miracles. He did not only tell men to believe in Him, and how to be good and get to Heaven. Besides telling them this, He formed His followers into a Society. He

made them, so to speak, into a Tribe, of which He was the Head or Chief.

Now this tribe, which has Christ for the Head of it, is called in the Bible, "The family of Jesus Christ." Thus Christ did not only teach, but formed His followers into a tribe or family, which we call the Church. Christ might go away from our sight. This we know by His Ascension. Yet he remains with His Church, as He said, "Lo, I am with you always, unto the end of the world." Now this Church had, just like a tribe, its officers or subchiefs under Christ, who was the one Head or Great Chief. These were chosen by Christ. They were first twelve in number. They are known as the Apostles. Their names are given in the New Testament. They were bade by Christ to do certain things. They were to rule and teach and baptize, and to forgive sinners, and to make an offering to God, and feed the people in the Holy Communion, and they were also to ordain others who would come after them. Our Lord also gave the Twelve the Holy Ghost. In this way, He ordained or gave them power to act for Him. The Holy Spirit came down and took up His abode in the Apostles, and He has remained ever since with their successors, and He so abides in the Church unto this day.

We see thus how Christ and the Holy Spirit together made, and how they both dwell in, the Church. Their presence makes the Church a living thing.

This took place about nineteen hundred years ago, and the Church slowly grew throughout the world.

In very early times — the second or third century — it came to Britain, now called England. It was not founded there by the Roman Church. It existed centuries in Britain independent of Rome.[1] Rome, about 596 A. D., sent a missionary there. By and by the old British Church and the Roman Mission became united. But when Rome became bad in doctrine and oppressive, the Church of England threw off the Papal yoke and became again independent. This was at the time of the Reformation, in the sixteenth century. The Church did not make a new Church, but reformed the old one. The old Church was not torn down and a new one built up in its place, but the old Church was cleansed and repaired. It was the same old Church, only restored. If anyone asks you, "Where was your Church before this time?" you can say, "Where is a man's face after it has been washed?" It is the same face as before, only made clean. It is the same house, only repaired. So at the Reformation the Church was made clean, but remained the same old Church it had been since it was founded. It came to this country. Your forefathers, becoming Christians, belonged to it, and Bishop Hobart was your Bishop.

Now God put on His Church four marks, by which it could be known. He gave it four marks which would separate it from all others. These

[1] "The ancient British Church, by whomsoever planted, was a stranger to Rome, and all his pretended authority." — *Blackstone*, IV., ch. 8.

four marks would keep us from making mistakes about it. It was just like this: when the logging men cut down a tree, before they put it into the water that is to float it down to the mill-town, they chop certain marks on each log to tell whose it is. So, when Christ put His Church into the stream of time, He marked it. He put these letters on it — A. H. C. O. These marks stand for "Apostolic," "Holy," "Catholic," "One." Any religion or body or Church that is Christ's Church will have all those four marks upon it. If they do not, it is not His Church, however good it may seem.

First, to be a true part of the Church which Christ has made, it must have the mark "A" upon it. A stands for Apostles. It must have come down to us from the Apostles. If it did not come from the Apostles, it would not be Christ's Church, but some man-made society. Again: Christ gave the Apostles power to ordain others as ministers, and said He would be with such to the end of the world. We see thus that that cannot be Christ's Church which had a beginning since Christ's time, as all the sects have. We see also that no persons have a right to call themselves ministers of Christ unless they have derived their authority from the Apostles to act for Christ. It is not enough for them to say they are inwardly called. We know that no American could go abroad to a foreign court and go to the King there and say he was inwardly called to be an Ambassador from the United States. He would not be received. He would

have to bring a paper to say that the President of the United States had sent him. Just so, no one can set himself up to be an ambassador of Christ unless he has received from Christ the right to act for Christ; and can prove he has the right in the way Christ set up, which was through the Apostles. This truth is called the doctrine of the *Apostolic Succession*, and is so called in your Prayer Book. Now your Bishops and Clergy have their power to act for Christ as coming down to them from the Apostles themselves. They can prove this. So what they do when they ordain, or confirm, or baptize, or forgive, or bless, it is by *Christ*, who acts by them as His agents and does these things. We ought to be very thankful that our tribe, taught by Bishop Hobart, has this gift of an Apostolically descended ministry. Always love and support your Priest.

Another sign of the true Church is that it must have the mark "H" upon it; it must be *holy*. This does not mean that all the members of it are holy. We wish they were. But it tells us that the Church has all the teachings and means to make us holy, if we will use them. Those bodies who have separated themselves from the Church, like the Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and others who left our Church about two or three hundred years ago, have lost some of these helps to be holy. They went out or seceded from the Church, and as they had no Bishops to ordain ministers, and no one who could confirm, and no priest who could absolve peni-

tents, or consecrate and offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar, they gave up the old Church's teaching, and so lost these many helps. But the old Mother Church has held on to the old Faith and ministry and sacraments, and to this dear Church you belong. It is a school where we may be educated for Heaven by being made holy. And you know how many of the tribe have by their lives shown what the dear Church can do for souls. You know the saintliness of your holy pastors, of Fathers Greenough, Burleson, and C. Hill, and of many devout souls who have died in the faith and whose bodies rest on the hill. Your forefathers who came out from New York, as they were loyal to their country's flag, so they were loyal to the Church's faith, and it shone forth in their lives. They look down upon you from Heaven and pray for you, that you may in like way be faithful unto the end. As you hope to meet them in Heaven, be not separated from them on earth. Keep to your Church, for it is the one Christ founded.

Another mark of the Church is that it should be "*Catholic*" — it should have the mark "C" on it. We say in our Creed we believe in "the Catholic Church." This word is sometimes misunderstood. It does not mean "Roman Catholic." We are not Roman Catholics, and never will be. The word "Catholic" means "universal." The religion of Christ is a universal religion. It is for all men, all countries, all races, all times. It is to go over the world and be preached as a witness for all people.

Now, what all persons in the Apostolic Church

have from the beginning and at all times and in all countries held and believed is a sure witness of what Christ taught. This is a grand truth and ought to be thought over and studied. You see that Christ, having divine knowledge of what would take place after He went away, and what His followers would come to believe, must have so taught His doctrines that the great majority of His believers would not get wrong ideas of it. He would be careful so to teach in so great a matter as religion that the majority of those who wished to know what they were to believe as His followers would not go wrong. So if we can find out what the great mass of Christians under the Apostolic ministry have always held, we shall know what Christ taught and what He wanted them to believe. This is called Catholic Doctrine, or doctrine believed by all who are members of the Apostolic Church. This is the true doctrine, for it is Christ's doctrine. It is the doctrine He taught and we teach, and what you hold.

The sectarians do not hold this. They have made up or invented doctrines for themselves. The Romans have done the same thing. Some of the doctrines they teach now were only put forth as dogmas in the last century. For instance, in 1854, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin was made a Dogma; and in 1870 the Pope was decreed to be in certain cases infallible. Now these were *new* dogmas, just as new as some the sects had made. They were additions made to the old Catholic Faith. They were unknown in the early

ages, to the great Doctors and Fathers of the early Church. Had anyone ventured to preach them, the people would have cried out, "Heresy; this is not the Catholic Faith!" So thank God, my dear sons and daughters, that in this branch of the true Church, while you are preserved from formal heresy, you hold loyally to the old Faith as members of the Catholic Church. This is to be found in the Creed, the Prayer Book, and the Sacraments. You have in these absolute certainty of what Christ taught. This faith will be your spiritual food in life and your sure defence and your shield in the hour of death. Love it, dear children, and live it. By living it we come to *know* it; and it makes new men.

The *fourth* mark of the true Church is "unity." It is the mark "One." The Holy Apostolic Catholic Church is *one* body. I want you, however, to think over and make clear to yourselves the difference in meaning between two ideas, namely — "unity" and "union." You will have to give it a little hard study.

You know a family is *one* family, and a tribe is *one* tribe. But the members of a family may fall out. The brothers and sisters may quarrel. They may separate and live apart. They might go so far as not to be willing to speak to one another. Then this is a case of a *disunited* family. It is still, however, *one* family. The unity of the family is not broken. It cannot be, for they are all from one stock. They have all the same blood in their veins. They are brothers and sisters. But intercourse and

love is broken, and it is a *disunited* family. Just so with a tribe. It is one by reason of its common origin and common descent. The members all come from the same stock. A common blood runs through their veins. It is one as a tribe. But its members may quarrel and separate, and then it is a divided or disunited tribe.

This difference between "Unity" and "Union" will help you to understand the oneness of the Church. Our Lord prayed that its members might be one as "He and the Father were one." Now the Father and the Son are one because they have the *same Nature.* So the members of the Catholic Church are *one,* having in them, by their common baptism, the same nature. They have been made by the Sacraments members of Christ. They have received the Holy Eucharist, and have, so to speak, the same blood in their veins. They are thus brothers and sisters in "the family of Jesus Christ." This is a unity that cannot be broken. The gates of Hell cannot prevail against it. The members may fall out with one another, but they are still the same family.

Now this is what has happened in the latter days of the Church. A separation has taken place between what is called the Eastern Churches, in Europe, and the Western, and the western part of Christendom has been divided into the Angelican, or English, and the Roman, or Latin, Communions. So we Anglicans belong, though this has happened, to the *One Church.* It is one, because all its members

together make up one family by being all members of Christ by Baptism.

And here we pause to say a word about the word "Union."

Our Lord desired that the members of His Church should not quarrel. He wished and prayed that they might be united, so that the world, seeing it, might be convinced of His divine mission. He wanted the Church to be so outwardly united that unbelievers, seeing this union, would say, "It is no earthly power that holds these Christians together." He prayed that this outward union, by its supernatural or grace-given character, would be a witness of His own supernatural life and mission. Now the Roman Catholic system, which would enforce a union of all the churches by putting them under a pope or a king, does not do this. It testifies to nothing supernatural. It is a kind of union man might make. But our Church and the Eastern Churches declare that the union, which is to bear witness to a divine mission, must be one made by the Holy Spirit; and that such a union was secured in the early days without a monarchical papacy. A papacy is not, therefore, a necessity for union. Indeed, it has been the greatest cause for disunion. It is by mutual charity, by each member of the Church submitting to the other, by each national Church to the others, that the union that witnesses to the supernatural is secured. When, therefore, a Romanist says "there is but one church," we can agree with him, and say "we are part of it." When he says

"we must be under the Pope to be united," we can say that the papacy has been the great cause of disunion. It has divided and torn the Church and keeps it apart. Romans have repeated the sin of Israel in desiring a visible head and king, and with the same result of division for its sinfulness. God may save a Roman Catholic, but we believe He hates the papacy as a worldly thing.

Again, we must be on our guard against some Roman mistakes. Sometimes ignorant Romanists will say that our Church was founded by a bad king, called Henry VIII. This man had about as much to do with making our Church as Pontius Pilate had with making Christianity. Pilate helped to put Christ to death, and Henry helped to deliver the Church from the Pope, but neither founded Christianity or the Church. Sometimes it is said that the Pope would not let the king be divorced, and so the king broke with him. The true story is that one of the Popes had done a very wicked thing, and let the king, when a young man, marry his deceased brother's wife. The king consulted the doctors and lawyers in the universities, all Roman Catholics, asking them if the Pope could do this, and they all said "No," so he felt that he was not lawfully married to Catherine, and could marry again. Both were bad, king and Pope, but the Pope was the worst.

Then again: Once Romanists used to say we had no valid orders. But their arguments broke down, one after another. Then by political in-

fluence, some got a late Pope to say our orders were no good. He only injured himself by doing so, for many Roman Catholic divines had said otherwise. The papal decree did not disturb us. We know that, just as truly as there is a God, we are true priests. By his false decree the Pope proved to us that he was not infallible, because we know, with divine certainty, he was wrong. If anyone says to you, "The Pope does not acknowledge your orders," we can say "we are glad of it." It shows how untrustworthy are his judgments. He may not acknowledge our orders, but God does, and we believe God rather than man.

This may all be very hard reading. So you must go to your priest or to the Sisters if you want any explanation of it. As I love you I want you to be good Christians and well-instructed Churchmen. Christ loved His Church, and I want you to know it and love it too. And here I will stop and let you think this over, and then you may, by and by, go on with the second part.

Part II

ON ROMANISM

There are good Christians among the Romanists. And so long as they do not try to upset our people and lead them astray, we let them alone. But as you know, they have been creeping in and trying to unsettle some of you. You must be on your guard against them. If you cannot answer

their statements, tell them to go to your priest, who is a learned and godly man, and he will do so.

You are in the One, Holy, Apostolic, Catholic Church already, and do not need to change. If a Romanist asks why your Church is also called "Protestant Episcopal," as well as Catholic, tell him that it is called Protestant because it protests against all the novel doctrines of the sects and those of Rome. It is also Episcopal in its government, and so not like Rome or the sects. The word Episcopal means a Bishop. Our Church has "Bishops," as the Catholic Church has always had from the beginning. It is not a Congregational church, or a church governed by the people or congregation. It is not like a Presbyterian church, or one without Bishops and governed by ministers called Presbyters. It is a Church having for its chief rulers Bishops, and is not a papal church, or under the Pope. While it is thus Protestant and Episcopal, it is part also of the one holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church Christ founded. You are thus in the true Church and have the ancient and true faith, without the Roman or sectarian errors.

Again: I want to tell you something about this Romanism which has a Pope or king at its head, who lives in Italy. Our Lord said: "By their fruits ye shall know them." But few of the Roman Catholic laity know much about the history of the Popes. There were some good ones amongst them. But there were also a number of very wicked and bad men, and many more worldly ones.

In the tenth century, we learn from a great Roman Catholic historian named Baronius, the papacy was for years in the power of three noted evil women who were prostitutes.[1] One of their bastard offspring they made Pope. Baronius wrote: "In this century, the Abomination of Desolation was seen in the Temple of the Lord. How hideous was the face of the Roman Church when filthy and impudent and bad women governed all at Rome, changed Sees at their pleasure, gave away Bishoprics, placed their gallants into the See of Peter."

Again in history we come to Pope Alexander VI, and there were others equally bad. "Pope Sergius has been loaded with every vice and every enormity which can blacken the character of man. One of his sons by Marozia, John XI, was raised to the papal throne. Later came John XII. A Cardinal testified he had seen him celebrate and not communicate himself. Another testified he had ordained a Bishop who was but ten years old. Other and darker charges followed, charges of adultery, incest, and that he had made the Lateran palace a brothel."[2] "He disgraced," says another writer, "the Papal dignity by the most shameless excesses, adultery, rape, and even incest. To such depths of degradation had the papacy been reduced."[3] John XIX, though yet a layman, was elevated to the papal throne and on his decease, the tiara was be-

[1] Also see Milman's *Lat. Christianity*, Vol. III., 157, 158.
[2] Milman's *Lat. Christianity*, Vol. III., 181.
[3] Reichel, *Middle Ages*, p. 120, 121.

stowed on his nephew Benedict IX, a boy in his teens. But, though a boy, his vices were the vices of a man, and moreover of a man utterly lost to shame. He perpetrated adultery, murder, and every kind of abomination with the greatest impunity.[1] It is impossible, says the ex-Jesuit, George Tyrrell, "that the knowledge and infallible interpretation of tradition" should be lodged "in a totally ignorant boy-pope like John XII or Benedict IX.

Now, as there was one Judas among the Apostles, so there might be some bad Popes. But what I want you to see is that the badness in Popes is destructive of the Roman claim that the Popes, when teaching all of us, cannot err. They are said to be infallible, in consequence of the gift of God they receive, to teach without error. Now no one can do this but by aid of the Holy Ghost. A bad priest might do certain things, like baptizing and consecrating, absolving, etc. He could do these things as an agent of Christ, though he was a bad man. But he could not decide or say what was the truth except the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, guided him. Now the Holy Spirit cannot dwell or work in bad men. Bad men are not under the help or guidance of the Holy Spirit, but of the devil. So you see how foolish the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility is. And it is proved to be false, because the Catholic Church condemned in a Council one of the Popes, named Honorius, for heresy.

Again: A large number of the Popes have been

[1] Reichel, *See of Rome*, p. 137.

very worldly men, given over to politics and the love of power. They have bought the Papacy, which destroys their claim, and given away its income to their children or other relatives. They have been filled with the love of power. The love of power made them claim to be kings over all kings; to have the power of absolving their subjects from all obedience, if the king did not please them. And this they did. This was directly contrary to what Christ said His Kingdom should be. You may be surprised at such a wicked claim, and ask how it came about that the Church in the western half of Europe accepted it. It is another sad and awful story. It came about largely by false writings, by a series of forged papers. We put forgers in the State Prison. Now these letters pretended to come from early times, and gave much power to the Pope. The people in those days did not know how to find out such forgeries, and so believed them. They got found out at last, and the Roman Catholics had at last to say that they were not true. But meantime the Pope had been claiming all this power and so imposing on the Church. Now you, as having Christian common sense, would know that if God wanted to make a Pope, and have a Pope over His Church, He could do it without resorting to a series of lies. A Church so largely built on misinterpretation of Holy Scripture and on man's lies cannot be the only true Church.

You may ask, perhaps, what sort of Popes there are now. Well, since the Reformation the Popes

and Cardinals have had to be more careful in their lives. But you must know that the Pope continued to be an earthly king till 1870, over a country called the "States of the Church." Now this government was about as bad as it could be. The people were oppressed, kept in ignorance, justice was badly administered, the country was impoverished. The priests made the people believe a lot of superstitions and kept them under their control. At last the Italians, Roman Catholics as they were, rebelled against the tyranny and made a United Italy with Victor Immanuel (a Roman Catholic) as their Head or Constitutional King. Certainly we who are Americans and whose forefathers fought for and got their freedom, cannot blame the Italians in their noble struggle for freedom. And how did the new government treat the Pope? He was treated most generously. He was in the exercise of all his spiritual powers as Bishop, protected, and was given $625,000 a year to live on. But what did he do? He cried and whimpered like a baby who has had his playthings taken away. He said that the Italians had no right to turn him out of his throne, and so he said he would not take the money from the Italian government, but would shut himself up in his great church and palace with its thousand rooms and large grounds, in which he could take a drive, and say he was a prisoner, and "ask the Church to support him"! It is of course a pretence, a cheat, a fraud. He is no prisoner, he is simply acting a part. He is deceiving the ignorant. He is acting out a

lie, and the poor Roman Catholics are forced to send out their money from America to support him and his Cardinals in their pomp and luxury. This is a free country, and if Roman Catholics want to be fooled, let them be fooled. But do not let yourselves be taken in. I think this living a lie business by the Pope shows that it is the same old, bad, worldly papacy it has been in the past.

Part III

ON ROMAN DOCTRINES

There is another matter I must tell you about. It is the Roman doctrine of teaching about the dead. We believe that Christians dying go to Christ and are at peace, and are prepared for Heaven. The Romans believe that Christians must suffer in purgatory. They must suffer, so they claim, to satisfy God's Justice, though their sins have been forgiven. The sufferings they must endure are terrible. It is much more severe than any earthly fire. Those in it are represented as crying out to their friends to have pity on them and help them: "O Father and Mother, Wife or Sister, help me out of this terrible suffering!" What a power this gives the priests over the people who believe them. To help their dear ones, they must have Masses said; and the Masses, remember, *must be paid for*, or alms must be given. Sometimes the poor are greatly impoverished by this drain upon them. Do you, dear brethren, want to believe the

dreadful doctrine that the good God thus punishes the children He has once pardoned? We believe in a good, loving Father, that welcomes home His penitent child, and takes him to His arms. Not one who forgives him and then thrashes him or puts him in the fire. We believe that Christ has made a full satisfaction on the Cross that satisfies God's Justice. We do not believe in giving money to the priest for any of the Sacraments, still less for offering the Mass to get souls out of purgatory. It is a dreadful religion, and we bid you keep away from it.

The doctrine of Purgatory, where good souls are tormented, is a dreadful doctrine. It is not in the Bible. It is only used to get money out of the people. It is one of Rome's superstitions and not like the pure, simple Gospel of Christ. Again, there is another wrong doctrine; it is called the gaining of "Indulgences." If you will do certain acts and give alms, you can yourself, or others, avoid the punishment in purgatory. It brings in a good income to the Church. But it is not in the Bible. And while it does not allow persons to sin, it teaches them how to avoid the punishment for sin, which is what persons most care about.

Again: The Roman Church teaches that the Blessed Virgin Mary is the *neck* of the Church. Christ is the Head, but Mary is the *neck*. And just as the blood passes from the head through our neck into our bodies, so grace passes from Christ to us through Mary. No text of Scripture can be

found that says this, and it leads to persons going to Mary for grace instead of going to Christ.

Again: The Roman Church only gives the Blessed Sacrament to the laity in one kind. The laity are not allowed to partake of the Chalice. They can only receive the consecrated wafer. Now, if you will read your Bible, in St. John's Gospel, chapter 6, verse 54, you will find that our Lord said: "He that eateth My Flesh and *drinketh My Blood* hath eternal life." And when He gave the Holy Communion, He said, "*Drink ye all* of it." He did not say to the Apostles or ministers, drink *ye* of it, but speaking to the Church, He said, "Drink ye all of it." This was what the Catholic Church understood the meaning to be, and for about twelve hundred years the Church always gave the Sacrament to the laity in both kinds. It does so now in the Eastern and Anglican Churches. But the Pope altered it. What right had he to alter Christ's words? What right to change Christ's commands? What right to go against the custom of the Catholic Church? How could he be wiser than Christ? Did not Christ know all about all the dangers of irreverence? And yet He said, "Drink ye *all* of this." It is a dreadful profanation of authority thus to set aside Christ's very words. But this is what Rome does. If, then, one goes to Rome, it is to cease to be a follower of Christ and become a follower of the Pope. It is to cease to be a Catholic and become a Papist. It is to do what Christ expressly forbade; to make

some one a master or a father whom we are to follow, instead of following the Church. It is a falling away from Christ to become a Papist.

Romanists will quote you the text, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church." Peter might be the foundation stone, but this would not give him any authority over the stones laid on him. The Apostles did not recognize him as having any authority over them. On the contrary, they *sent* Peter on a mission to Samaria, and divided the jurisdiction of the Jews and Gentiles between Paul and Peter. This shows they were over him, not he over them. There is nothing in this misunderstood text about Peter that gives any office to Peter which he was to hand on to a successor. He had the keys and used them to open the kingdom to both Jew and Gentile. He did the first on the day of Pentecost, when the converted Jews were baptized, and he brought in the first Gentiles when he baptized the Gentile soldier, Cornelius. He thus led the lambs of the new Gospel order and the sheep of the old into Christ's Kingdom. But no authority was given him over the Apostles, for when St. Peter asked our Lord about St. John, saying, "What shall this man do?" our Lord said, "What is that to thee?" or in other words, "that is none of your business."

Our Lord prayed for Peter, that his faith should not fail, but not that he should be infallible. And so St. Paul treated him as being in error, and rebuked him for it. When Peter was converted after

his fall, being forgiven, he was to strengthen his brother Apostles, who as brethren were his equals. He was not to be the Vine, but Christ was to be the Vine and Peter only a branch, as Christ said, "I am the Vine, and ye (including Peter) are the branches. Besides all this you must see, my sons, that there is nothing in the Bible that says that Peter ever went to Rome, and it is impossible to believe that God would have our salvation depend on our being under the Bishop or Pope of Rome, and never tell us that Peter went there.

Let no man deceive you about the Papacy. Catholicity is one thing, the Roman Papacy is another. Hold fast the true Catholic faith and make it your own by living it.

Part IV

THE GREAT SIN OF JOINING THE ROMAN CHURCH

My dear Sons and Daughters in Christ, it is a very great sin for any Churchman to leave their own Church, where they have the true Faith and Sacraments, and join the Roman Church. Let me tell you why. If one joins the Roman Church he has to be confirmed again. He has to receive the Communion as if it were his first Communion. Now see what that means. When you were confirmed by the Bishop, you received the gifts of the Holy Spirit. You cannot be confirmed again, any more than you can be baptized again. To be confirmed again is to deny that you have already been

confirmed. It is to be a traitor to the Holy Spirit. It is to turn on the Holy Spirit and to deny Him. It is to say to Him, I have never received You in Confirmation. This is to sin against the Holy Ghost, and if we sin against the Holy Ghost, Christ warned us that such a sin, persisted in, could not be forgiven in this world nor in the next. This should make us careful not to commit such.

So, too, about the Blessed Sacrament. Christ the dear Lord has fed you with His own Body and Blood. To go over to Rome, and to receive your first Communion, is to say, in act, to our Lord, "I have never sacramentally received You." It is like Peter's denial of our Lord. How it must pain His sacred heart! What a stab it gives Him! Those who go over to Rome thus run great risks of their final salvation. Be true to your Church, and you are safe. In it you have found Christ and been united to Him. Abiding in Him you are safe. Love your Church. Love each other. Stand together. Try and bring back the wanderers, and God will protect and bless you and yours.

Your Bishop and Father in God,

C. C. Fond du Lac.

[See page 163 for Reply]

INDEX

INDEX

Aaron, 83, 84, 189
Abraham, 140, 160
"Absolution in God's Word," Tract on, 143
Adam, the first, 193, 233
Adam, the second, 193
Advent, Church of the, 26, 111, 143, 173
Advent Mission, the, New York, 107
Albany, 60
Alexander VI., Pope, 336
All Saints', London, 29, 58, 98, 206
All Saints' Bombay Association, 116
All Saints' Sisters, the, 76, 77
Altar Cloths, 34
American Prayer Book, the, 252
Anglican Church, the, 238, 276
Anglican Communion, the, catholicity of, 280
Anglican Orders, 151
Antonius, the Metropolitan, 136
A. P. A., the, 34
Apostles, the, 203, 229, 234, 316, 324, 326, 343
Apostolic Succession, 298, 304, 327
A. P. U. C., the, 33, 34
Ark, the, 192
Asbury, 286
Aurelius, Marcus, 319
"Autobiography," Grafton's, 155
Autonomy, 86

Baltimore, 27, 61, 66, 75, 79, 80, 89, 152
Baptism, 235, 247, 260, 332
Baptismal Regeneration, 286
Baptist Church, the, 81
Baronius, 336
Beals, the Rt. Rev. Dr., 122
Beard, Mrs., 35
Belgium, 34
Bell, 60
Benedict, 89
Benedict IX., Pope, 337
Benson, Rev. R. M., 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 64, 65, 67, 73, 74, 76, 80, 86, 88, 107, 116, 117, 211
Birkbeck, Mr., 135, 136, 138
Birmingham, 91
Bishop, Mr., 35, 42, 43, 62
Bolles, Dr., 26
Book of Common Prayer, the, 245
Boston, 26, 45, 62, 63, 89, 112, 234
"Boston Post," the, 106
"Boston Transcript," the, 147
Brechin, Bishop of, 41, 49, 63, 77
Breck, Lloyd, 58

Briar Cliff, 89
Bridgeport, 62
Bristol, 71
Brotherhood, the, Grafton's early plans for, 42, 48
Brotherhoods, 34
Brown, Bishop J. H. H., 116
Buel, Dr., 109
Bumpton, 71
Burleson, Father, 328
Byron, 310

Calmet, 22
Cambridge–Camden Ecclesiological Society, the, 206
Cannes, 116
Canon, a, defined, 133
Canterbury, the Archbishop of, 118, 137, 147, 244
Carter, Mr., 29, 37, 41, 49, 58, 70, 73, 77, 205
Cathedral, the, at Fond du Lac, 134, 154, 162
"Catholic Atlas," Grafton's, 155
Catholic Club, the, Boston, 122
Catholic Church, the, defined, 328
Catholic Doctrine, the, 329
Chamberlain, Mr., 63
Chamberlain, T., 30
Charles I., 176, 177
Charles II., 177
Chicago, 113, 138, 172
Children, at the Eucharist, 215
"Christian and Catholic," Grafton's, 145–159
Christianity, must vanquish slavery, 2, 25
Christ, as the second Adam, 193, 202, 217; His resurrection and ours, 228–234; His Virgin Birth, 234, 246, 247, 259, 261, 301, 319, 323
Chudoff Monastery, the, 141
"Church Almanac," the, 61
Church Discipline Bill, the, 211
Church Home and Infirmary, the, Baltimore, 249
Church in America, the, 39, 58
"Churchman," the, 122, 147
Church of England, the, 32
"Church Standard," the, 147
"Church Times," the, 30, 36
Church Union, the, 210
Cistercian Monastery, the, 33
Clairvaux, 107
Clayton, 60
Coke, 286
Clewer Sisters, the, 77, 79
Collins, Judge, 210
Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the, 237
Copernican System, the, 257, 281
Cornelius, 159
Corpus Christi, the Feast of, 237
Cowley Fathers, the, 106
Craik, Rev. Dr., 224
Crapsey, 284, 288
Cretonsville, 79
Cromwell, Oliver, 177, 285
Cummins, Bishop, 286

Day Hours, the, 87
Deitrich, 34
Derry, the Bishop of, 258

DIVES, 159, 160
DIX, MORGAN, 36, 63, 65, 73, 81
DOANE, Bishop, 122, 144
DÖLLINGER, 85
DOWIEISM, 170
DUPANLOUP, Bishop, 175
DURAND, 30

EASTBURN, Bishop, 39, 40, 56
EAST GRINSTEAD, 31, 78
"ECCLESIASTIC," the, 30
ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, the Fourth, 283
EDDY, Mrs. MARY BAKER, 179
EDDYISM, 170
EDWARD VI., 285
ELIZABETH, Queen, 285
ELY, the Bishop of, 208
EMERSON, 319
ENGLISH CHURCH UNION, the, 135
"EPISCOPAL," meaning of the word, 335
EUCHARIST, the, 215
EVANS, Dr., 224
EVOLUTION, 257

FARRAR, Canon, 177
FAY, Mr., 37, 43, 44, 46, 47, 62, 115
FISKE, Prof. JOHN, 281
FORBES, Dr., 81
FORGED DECRETALS, the, 255
FOULKES, Dr., 84
FOX, Mr., 42
FRANCISCAN ORDER, the, 96, 103
FULTON, Dr., 147

GARDNER, Father, 86, 87, 88, 89, 109, 112, 113, 114, 117
GARNETT, WILLIAM I., 57
GENERAL CONVENTION, the, described, 197
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, the, 109
GILSON, 79
GOLDSMITH, OLIVER, 307
GRAFTON, C. C., essay on relation of master and slave, 1, circulated by Wendell Phillips, 1; his views on slavery, 1–25; letters to Prescott, 26, 31, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65, 70, 74, 76, 78, 79, 86, 87, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118; his plans for a Brotherhood, 42, 48; letter to Fay, 47; a fragment, 55; letters to Dr. Oliver, 81, 85; withdrawal from the Order, 86; an American Religious Community, 89–106; correction in "Boston Post," 106; plans for a new Order, 108; letters to a young priest, 119–123; letter to his candidates for Holy Orders, 123; letters to a layman, 134–144; as to "Christian and Catholic," 145; sermon on the rich, 159; letter to one in sorrow, 164; letters to an aspirant, 165; letters to a goddaughter, 176–183; letter to a Bishop, 184; letter to a Canadian layman, 186; his views concerning the Lord's Supper, 186–195; letters to the "Living Church," 195–234; reminiscences, 205; comments on Bishop Kozlowski

and the Quadrilateral, 212; views on children at the Eucharist, 215; views on reservation of the Sacrament, 216; views on Christ's Resurrection and ours, 228; letter to the "Southern Churchman," 234; views on Christ's Virgin Birth, 232; address on the Feast of Corpus Christi, 237; annual addresses, 242–306; his Grafton Hall address, 307; his speech at Church Club dinner, 313; letter to the Oneidas, 322–345; his views on Romanism, 334; his views on Roman Doctrines, 340
GRAFTON HALL, Fond du Lac, 154, 155, 307
GREENOUGH, Father, 328
GUEST HOUSE, the, Moscow, 137

HALL, Father, 88
HALLAM, 176
HARRISON, 71, 72
HARWOOD, Dr., 60, 61
HAWKES, Rev. Dr., 224
HENRY VIII., 333
HIGH CHURCHMAN, the, 235
HILL, C., Father, 328
HOBART, Bishop, 325, 327
HOLY COMMUNION, the, Bishop Grafton's views concerning, 186–195
HOLY CROSS, the Society of the, 58
HOLY EUCHARIST, the, 201
"HOLY EUCHARIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT," the, Tract on, 262
HOLY NATIVITY, Sisterhood of the, 89, 110, 142, 154, 169, 196
HOLY SYNOD, the, 150
HONORIUS, Pope, 337
HOOKER, 224
HOUSE OF BISHOPS, the, described, 197
HURST, 31
HUXLEY, 254

IGNATIUS, Brother, 31, 32, 33, 36
INCARNATION, Church of the, 61
INDIAN BUDDHIST PANTHEISM, 255
INDIAN MISSIONS, 58
INNOCENT, Bishop, 141
ITALIANS, the, 339

JAMES I., 177
JARDINE, 110
JESUIT COLLEGE, the, 65
JESUITS, the, 103
JEWS, the, 194
JOHN, Father, 136
JOHN XI., Pope, 336
JOHN XII., Pope, 336
JOHN XIX., Pope, 336
JOHNSON, Dr., 16, 176
JOHNSTON, 79
JOSHUA, 83, 84
JUKE, 40, 42

KEBLE, 41, 49, 55, 78, 205, 213
KEBLE COMMITTEE, the, 55
KELLY, Chief Baron, 210
KENSIT, 211
KING, Dr., 211
KIREEFF, General, 136
KORTESCUE, Provost, 58

Kozlowski, Bishop, 212, 213
Kremlin, the, 141

Lambeth, the, 118
Lane, Mr., 40, 42
Lavra, the, St. Petersburg, 136
Law of God, contrasted with Law of Slavery, 7
Law of Slavery, contrasted with Law of God, 7; annulled by Doctrine of New Testament, 23
Lazarus, 182, 230
Lecky, Mr., 141, 142
Lee, Rev. G. F., 26, 30
Levin, Mr., 80
Liddon, Canon, 39, 41, 49, 75, 77, 177, 213, 310
Liggett, Rev. P. N., 255
Lincoln, the Bishop of, 211
Littledale, Dr., 30
Littlemore, 71
London, 31, 43, 47, 71, 211
London, the Bishop of, 77, 147, 224
Long Island, 79
Lord's Supper, 186, 214, 241
Low Church Association, the, 208, 209, 210
Low Church Party, the, 207
Lowder, Charles, 196, 206

Macaulay, 176
Mackonochie, 196, 206, 208
McLaren, Bishop, 86, 213
McQuery, 288
Man, rights of, 8–9
Manning, Archbishop, 30, 68, 84, 208
Mariolatry, 116
Marozia, 336
Marriage, defined as between slaves, 12; Christian, 264
Marriott, 205
Maryland, 79
Mary, Queen, 285
Mary, Virgin, 341
Masters, Mr., 111
Memphis, 224
Methodism, 235
Milan, 93
Milman, 336
Milton, 176
Milwaukee, 155, 173
Mormonism, 170
Moscow, 135, 137, 138
Moscow, the Metropolitan of, 137, 138
Moscow, the Patriarchate of, 151
Moses, 83, 84
Mt. Cassino, 41

Nashotah House, 58, 117, 154, 158, 173
Neale, Dr., 33, 36, 39, 40, 69, 75, 77, 78
Newbolt, Canon, 177
New Haven, 86, 115
Newman, Cardinal, 84, 91, 208, 286
Newport, 89
New York, 61, 62, 79, 86, 109, 121, 145
Nonjurors' Scotch Prayer Book, the, 247
Norris, Mr., 75
Norwich, the Bishop of, 135
Noyes, 62

Oliver, Dr., 81, 85
Oneida Indians, the, 155, 162–164; Bishop Grafton's letter to, 322
O'Neil, Rev., 40, 42, 224, 251
Onesimus, 17
O'Niel, 80
Oratorians, the, 96
Oxford, 27, 30, 41, 43, 58, 64, 65, 69, 70, 91
Oxford, Bishop of, Reading Mission of, 71
Oxford House, the, 65

Paddock, Bishop, 87, 88, 224
Paget, Dean, 177
Pearson, Bishop, 202
Perryman, 79
Philadelphia, 75, 86
Philanthropy, 170
Philemon, 17
Phillips, John, 34
Phillips, Wendell, circulates Essay on "Master and Slave," 1
Pilate, Pontius, 333
Plymouth, 114
Polish Catholic Movement, the, 149, 212
Pope, the, 84, 102, 116, 180, 329, 333, 334, 335, 336
Portland, Maine, 155
Potter, Bishop, 144, 146, 149
Prescott, Mary, 69
Prescott, Rev. Oliver, letters from Father Grafton to, 26, 31, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65, 70, 74, 76, 78, 79, 86, 87, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118
Prestbury, 65, 71
Prince, Mr., 60
Privy Council, the, 209
Providence, R. I., 120, 121, 143, 155, 176, 177
Purchas, 210
Purgatory, the doctrine of, 341
Puritans, the, 177, 239
Pusey, Dr., 29, 30, 33, 39, 41, 45, 49, 56, 62, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 73, 78, 96, 205, 210, 213, 298, 304

Quadrilateral, the, 212, 213, 214

Racine, 172
Rankin, Mr., 64, 70
Raphael, the Archimandrite, 141, 157
Raphaels, J., 71
"Real Presence," the, Tract on, 171
Rector, a, defined, 132
Reform, 171
Reformation, the, 325
Reichel, 337
Reisterstown, 80
Religious Life, the, 58, 93, 94, 97, 113
Religious Orders, revival of, 30, 41
Retreat, the, at Hurst, 31
Rich, Dr., 80
Ridsdale, 210
Ritualists, the, 209, 210, 212
Rivington, Father Luke, 116
Rivington, Mrs. Frank, 117
Rome, 82
Rome, the Bishop of, 180

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, the, 82, 95, 99, 102, 103, 328
ROMAN DOCTRINES, views on, 340
RUPLIN, Chief Justice, 4
RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH, the, New York, 122, 150
RUSSIAN SYNOD, the, 151

SABLER, Mr., 137
SACERDOTALISM, 318
SACRAMENT, the reservation of, 216, 244, 298
ST. AIDAN, 297
ST. ALBANS, N. Y., 39
ST. ALBAN'S, London, 98
ST. ALEXIS, 137
ST. BARNABAS, Sisterhood of, 91
ST. BERNARD, 107
ST. CATHERINE'S SCHOOL, 112
ST. CECILIA, 143
ST. EDWARD'S, 144, 145, 149
ST. GEORGE'S MISSION, 71
ST. JOHN, 193, 232
ST. JOHN BAPTIST, Sisterhood of, 91
ST. JOSEPH, 139, 140, 317
ST. LOUIS, 114
ST. LUKE, 317
ST. LUKE'S, Baltimore, 61, 70, 80
ST. MARGARET, Sisterhood of, 91
ST. MARK'S, 75
ST. MARTIN'S HALL, 31, 32, 33
ST. MARY, Sisterhood of, 91
ST. MARY'S, Baltimore, 117
ST. MARY'S CHURCH, N. Y., 155
ST. MATTHEW, Chapel of, Baltimore, 27, 35
ST. MICHAEL, the Monastery of, 138
ST. PAUL, 17, 42, 193, 201, 202, 260, 261, 297
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, Baltimore, 79, 223
ST. PETER, 43, 136, 145, 201, 234, 343
ST. PETERSBURG, 136
ST. PETER'S IN THE EAST, London, 98
ST. RAPHAEL, 71
ST. SAVIOR'S, Church of, Moscow, 138
ST. SIMON, 66
ST. STEPHEN, 202, 241
ST. THOMAS, 314
SAUL, 241
SCARBOROUGH, Bishop, 146
SCOTCH LITURGY, the, 252
"SCOTTISH CHRONICLE," the, 148
SEABURY, Dr., 46, 252
SEOGIA, the Exarch of, 136
SERGIUS, Pope, 336
SEYMOUR, Bishop, 86
SHATTUCK, Dr., 27
SHOREDITCH, 251
SISTERHOODS, the, 54, 58
"SISTERHOODS," book on, 110
SISTERS, the, at Wantage, 34, 35
SLAVE, the relation to master, of, 1–25; legally defined, 3; effect of Law of Slavery upon, 7; legal definition of marriage of, 12; power of master over, 13
SLAVERY, Jewish, 3, 16, 17
SLAVERY, Roman, 3
SLAVERY, Southern, views on, 1–25; popular fallacies, 15
SOCIALISM, 171

Society of Jesus, 63
Society of St. John, the, 106
Solomon, 142
Spanish Armada, the, 285
Spiritual Care, the, defined, 133
Spiritualism, 170
Springfield, 142
Stanley, Dean, 285
Stroud, Judge, 4
Stuarts, the, 176
Styer, 79
"Stylites," 66

Tait, Archbishop, 224, 251
Thanksgiving Day, 239, 280
Tikhon, Bishop, 122, 141, 150, 151
Tract 90, the, 30
Tractarian Movement, the, 205, 303
Tritheism, 314
Troitsa, the, Moscow, 137, 138
Tychicus, 22
Tyrrell, George, 337

"Union Review," the, 30
Unitarians, the, 320

Vattel, 224
Vestments, 33, 35
Victor Immanuel, King, 339
Virgin Birth, the, 234, 317
Vladimir, the Metropolitan, 137

Walker, Dr., 266
Walsh, Mr., 57
Wantage, 34
Ward, Mr., 79, 84
Wesley, 207, 255
Westbury, Lord, 210
Whittingham, Bishop, 249
William of Orange, 176
Williams, Bishop, 57
Wisconsin, 118
Wood, Mr., 40, 42
Woodford, Canon, 208
Wyatt, Dr., 223

York, the Archbishop of, 245
Young, 110

BX
5845
G71 A3

V.7

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 001 008 828 4

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

Series 9482